



PARTNERSHIP
Council of Europe & European Commission

SEMINAR ON T-KIT 7 "UNDER CONSTRUCTION - CITIZENSHIP, YOUTH AND EUROPE"

WARSAW 10 – 14 MAY 2005

Documentation

*Organised within the Partnership Programme on European youth worker training run by the
European Commission and the Council of Europe*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since its creation in 1998 as a joint initiative of the Council of Europe and the European Commission, the Partnership Programme on European Youth Worker Training (the Partnership) has sought to address the theme of European Citizenship and its relevance to young people through three main channels: a training offer, research and the Euromed programme. Currently, it is running a series of 6 training modules on European Citizenship, the first one of which took place in December 2004. The evaluation seminar of the first 3 modules took place in June and the next three modules will take place in autumn/winter of this year. With regard to publications, there have been several articles published in its bi-annual magazine, Coyote, related to European Citizenship and it published a T-kit titled "Under Construction-Citizenship, Youth and Europe" (number 7 in the series) in 2003. To support the dissemination of this T-kit and to promote the use thereof as an educational resource for European youth workers, a 3.5 day seminar was organised by the Partnership and hosted by the Polish National Agency in Konstancin on the outskirts of Warsaw from 10-14 May 2005. 19 participants from 13 Council of Europe member states and from a diversity of youth work backgrounds attended the seminar, which took place to coincide with the second European Youth Summit (15-16 May), organised by the Council of Europe and the European Youth Forum, which also took place in Warsaw. The European Youth Summit, in turn, had been organised within the framework of the 3rd Council of Europe Summit of Heads of State and Government, which took place in the Polish capital from 16-17 May and thus represented a channel through which its participants, and by extension the participants of the T-kit seminar, could debate Europe Citizenship and present their recommendations on the theme to government representatives. This seminar was a pilot initiative, an experiment to test the feasibility and purposefulness of carrying out seminars on other T-kits in the series in the future.

The 3.5 days of the seminar were structured in a manner that guided participants on an educational process through a number of sessions that engaged with the theme from different angles and which followed a coherent sequence, each subsequent session building on the previous one. The first main block of exercises was about exploring and engaging with the concept of European Citizenship; first from a personal angle, in discussing our senses of belonging and identity and the role it plays in influencing our participation as citizens. Participants discussed how their work with young people was an expression of their citizenship. Interestingly, participants not only analysed the link between their own perceived senses of belonging and their capacity to participate as citizens but also highlighted that "the way people perceive you also defines and/or limits your possibilities to participate as a citizen". In the next session, participants were forced to take a position vis-à-vis statements regarding the hypothetically defining elements or identifying factors of European Citizenship. During this exercise, many important questions were raised, among which: the relevance of territory in the definition, the relevance of legal status, the relevance of rights and responsibilities and the relevance of values (common "European" values). Many interesting insights arose regarding the categories of rights, duties, participation, identity and privilege. In fact the whole day was a general exploration and engagement with theories in relation to the theme of the seminar, of both a personal

and more academically recognised nature. The sessions afforded interaction among the participants regarding their personal definitions or ideals or lived experiences of European Citizenship. One issue that arose was the question of the role of “denizens” (residents in a country without citizenship status), in the sense that citizenship is also equivalent to participation. Gavan Titley, one of the training team, gave the example of a Pakistani woman who travelled to London to receive a citizenship award for setting up a NGO in Lancaster, but who had to rush back from the ceremony to appear in court to receive her deportation order.

In an interactive theoretical input that followed, the bases for and the main conventional models of citizenship were discussed, parting from the premise that citizenship is membership of a political community which involves a set of relationships between rights, duties, participation and identity. The next step involved pooling all the definitions, both institutional, philosophical and personal definitions and dimensions and, in line with the metaphor “under construction”, construct a puzzle of European citizenship. Many interesting issues were addressed during this exercise, including the influence of religious heritage in the construction of Europe and the concern that the political European Citizenship project being promoted by the main two European institutions is being shaped by a majority dominant culture and that it fosters more “elitist supranationalism” rather than an attitude of “embracing diversity”. Continuing in this vein, a whole debate around the ambiguity of what constitutes a “good” and active European citizen evolved. The point was raised that on the one hand you have an educated elite discussing concepts of European citizenship while the wide public do not even understand the terminology. One participant from Sardinia addressed the difficulty for some Europeans to become “good/active” European citizens due to their geographical location. If in some parts of Sardinia, there is no access to information or opportunities, then the population cannot be aware of their rights and duties as Europeans. A further debate addressed the “never again” principle of guaranteeing permanent peace in Europe. One participant from Serbia noted that pioneering ideas of Europe as a peace project or a cultural project as opposed to a purely economic project require a shift in perception and will therefore take time before it takes root. Although there was a clear tendency to focus on the value-dimension of European Citizenship among all the participants, those from EU member states tended to talk more about values and less about privileges and rights. One participant from an EU member state attributed this to the possibility that they take their privileges and rights for granted and do not need to strive for them. More non-EU members drew attention to the importance of legal status and thus mostly saw European Citizenship in terms of EU citizenship. In the session on T-kit 7, the conceptual framework of European Citizenship was introduced in more detail, participants were given some idea of how the T-kit be used and how some elements can be relevant for day to day work with young people. There was also an exercise to put one of the key resources of the T-kit into practice (European Citizenship Education Matrix).

On the last day of the seminar, the participants had been invited to take part in a debate in the Polish Parliament with two other external youth groups, within the scope of the 2nd European Youth Summit, which was taking place from 15-16 May. This final debate was foreseen as the culmination of the pedagogical process which the participants had gone through and an opportunity to further discuss the questions that had crystallised and had been put into perspective during the short seminar. There were four questions around the relevance of European Citizenship to youth work. The last question focused on how European Citizenship could become a beneficial

framework for the work with young people. One group of participants interpreted the question as granting them the legitimacy to define European Citizenship for themselves and thus to include in its concept constructive elements that built together would become a beneficial skeleton/framework for their work with youth, e.g. if mobility, political participation and intercultural opportunities all played a central role in what European Citizenship is all about, then it could become a beneficial framework. Other participants argued that European Citizenship is too abstract a concept to call it a framework, as frameworks are usually quite defined and structured. Even if they perceived their right to take part in its definition, they felt that it lacked an institutional definition, an official authoritative set of coordinates by which to orientate oneself. While there are many papers written by European institutions (i.e. EU and the CoE) that somehow articulate the foundations on which European Citizenship are and should be based and while these existing instruments should be used as a framework (e.g. ECHR, EUGHR), some participants felt the need to have a definitive document on European Citizenship.

In conclusion, in light of all the discussions and exercises that took place during the seminar, the main challenges the participants saw for themselves as youth workers interested in working with young people on the theme of European Citizenship was to first try to define the political community in which European Citizenship is anchored and then to find mechanisms that would allow young people to see the relevance of European Citizenship to their lives and the link between it and their needs. With regard to the T-kit as an educational resource that could aid them in these challenges, participants recognised the value of T-kit 7 as the basis for a more discursive approach to the theme of European Citizenship rather than a resource that would provide new methodologies and approaches. One participant highlighted its value as a preparatory resource for the actual youth worker, in order to gain solid background knowledge about the evolving theory of what European Citizenship is and is not before designing activities that address this. One key issue for reflection into gaining insight on how to work on the theme with young people would be the value of analysing the needs or at least the motivation behind the interest of youth in European citizenship. This point for reflection could possibly be incorporated into a general needs analysis of the young people any of the participants work with.

INTRODUCTION

Background to the interest of the Partnership Programme in the theme of European Citizenship

This seminar on T-kit 7 (Under construction: Citizenship, youth and Europe) was organised within the framework of the Partnership Programme on European Youth Worker Training (the Partnership), a joint initiative of the Council of Europe and the European Commission created in 1998 when the two institutions decided to take common action in this field. The youth policies of both institutions, implemented primarily through the instruments, activities and funding of the Directorate of Youth and Sport of the Council of Europe and the YOUTH Programme (2000 to 2006) of the European Commission, share a lot of common ground. Both institutions promote the active participation of youth in the construction of Europe (as a political and philosophical project) by supporting the development and implementation of European youth projects: youth meetings and exchanges, trans-national voluntary service projects, youth initiatives, study sessions and training courses for youth workers/leaders, networking and co-operation between youth work structures in Europe, youth information projects, the development of publications, etc. The youth projects supported by these two European institutions cover a wide spectrum; they involve all actors in the field of youth work and are based on a non-formal education approach.

The Partnership, now in its fifth covenant, was set up “to promote active European citizenship and civil society by giving impetus to the training of youth leaders and youth workers working within a European dimension”. Its ultimate goal is to raise the standards of such youth worker/leader training at a European level and define quality criteria for such training. This goal is pursued through a training offer, research and the Euromed programme (promotion of cooperation between youth in Europe and non-EU Mediterranean countries). Besides offering training and carrying out research regarding youth work and youth policy, the Partnership is active on two other fronts: it produces publications (both paper and electronic versions of training materials and the bi-annual Coyote magazine) and networking tools (trainers’ pool and exchange possibilities). The training materials referred to are a series of thematic handbooks called T-kits, of which number seven in the series is the protagonist of this seminar. T-kit 7, entitled “Under construction- Citizenship, Youth and Europe” was published by the Partnership in 2003 and, unlike its T-kit counterparts, it was conceptualised as less of a manual or a “toolkit” and more as an exploration of the theme of European Citizenship. It is an introduction to the presently evolving theory and the different practical educational approaches to it.

European Citizenship is of course an extremely topical subject across the whole continent. There are huge wide-ranging philosophical and political debates as to what Europe is, against a backdrop of the increasing expansion and consolidation of the European Union and the Council of Europe, not only in terms of geographical territory but also with in terms of competencies and political legitimacy. Citizenship is also a

hotly contested concept, especially in light of the decreasing importance of nation states and the dilution of national identities due to cross-cultural influences in our globalised world. Thus, for its inhabitants, Europe has become an important stage on which to develop and act out their ever-evolving and negotiated understandings of citizenship. The Partnership Programme is particularly interested in embracing and addressing these developments from the perspective of youth, in recognising their undeniable potential to be positive change agents and social actors on this stage called Europe.

Concept of the Seminar

This T-kit seminar on European Citizenship, hosted by the Polish National Agency from 10-15 May 2005 is a pilot initiative. Following several pilot training courses on European Citizenship between 2001 and 2003 and having executed the first three modules of a series of six short-term training modules (pending evaluation) on European Citizenship, the Partnership decided to offer a seminar for European youth workers on the topic of T-kit 7, entitled “Under construction- Citizenship, Youth and Europe”. The purpose of running this T-kit seminar is twofold; firstly there is the obvious interest in promoting and investigating the theme of European Citizenship among youth workers through the use of the T-kit as an educational resource, and secondly, the seminar serves as an experiment to test the utility and suitability of running seminars on other T-kits in the series.

The Seminar was in the work-plan of the 4th Covenant on Training. Negotiations with the Polish national agency of the Youth Programme were started in 2004. The idea was followed up and preparation meetings were held in March and April 2005 in Strasbourg. A joint decision was taken between the Partnership and the Polish National Agency to hold the Seminar within the framework of the second European Youth Summit which took place in Warsaw on 15-16 May 2005, so that the two events could support each other on different levels. The second European Youth Summit was itself organised (by the Council of Europe and the European Youth Forum) within the framework of Third Council of Europe Summit of Heads of State and Government, which also took place in Warsaw on 16-17 May 2005, with the hope that the Youth Summit would serve as an opportunity to lobby the governments on important youth issues.

Main Aims of the T-kit Seminar

To promote the European Citizenship concept through the more effective use of T-Kit number 7: Under Construction: Citizenship, Youth and Europe

To promote the Partnership of the Council of Europe and the European Commission

Learning Objectives for the T-Kit Seminar

- Engage with different understandings of European Citizenship and frameworks for European citizenship;
- Relate these understanding and frameworks to current and planned youth work practice;
- Understand the nature of T-Kit as an educational resource and consider how it can be used in youth work practice;
- To examine the relationship between youth work and participatory citizenship and the political contexts in which these practices take place;
- Work with the group understanding of (European) citizenship as a personal and political practice.

Profile of participants

Participants to the seminar were to be youth workers actively involved in the Youth Programme of the European Commission and the programmes of the Council of Europe, who implemented multiplying activities in the last 2 years. They had to be over 18 years old and able to work in English. In total, the seminar could have hosted 24 to 30 participants, while ensuring a balance in geographical, gender and institutional terms. In the end, however, owing principally to the fact that some people had difficulties in getting an entry visa into Poland, only 18 of the 25 selected participants took part plus one person from the waiting list.

There were 96 applications submitted to the Polish NA. As mentioned above, 25 participants were chosen and a waiting list of 6 applicants was drawn up. In addition to the above profile requirements, participants were also selected according to the following criteria:

Applicants who were:

- not complete beginners on the subject;
- not motivated to attend because of academic studies;
- directly involved with young people;
- potential teachers of citizenship education in schools;

The priorities lay with applicants who did not come from capital cities; ensuring gender balance in the group; one person per country if possible unless more applicants are really so relevant from the same country, with the exception of Poland (being the host country).

According to the team, there had been some problems with the recruitment and selection process, therefore there was slight apprehension concerning whether the participants selected would actually correspond well to the profile of the participants outlined in the invitation- call for participants. However upon arrival and after the initial group- building exercises, the team concluded that the participants effectively made a good balanced heterogeneous group.

In order to address the needs of the participants in more depth, a pre-seminar questionnaire (see appendix no. 3) was drawn up and sent in advance of the T-kit seminar to all selected participants. The results of these questionnaires were supposed to be reviewed during the preparation meeting on the day before the seminar began. Unfortunately only seven questionnaires were returned, despite repeated requests by the team to the participants to hand in the questionnaires even after arrival. Therefore, in effect, the foreseen aim of deducting further useful information from the participants regarding their background and motivations was hindered.

For comprehensive list of participants and the names of their organisations, see appendix no. 1

OVERALL PROGRAMME INTRODUCTION:

Main contents and issues addressed

Although the overall aims and learning objectives of the T-kit seminar have been outlined above, this section deals with how those aims and objectives were organized into steps for implementation and achievement. During the preparation of this seminar, it was decided that the main contents of the seminar would be organized into a number of working sessions, which would address the following **concepts and themes**:

- Democracy and democratic society
- Equality and inclusion
- European values
- European citizenship: what it is and what it is not
- Why do we address the issue of European Citizenship?
- Concepts + relation to practices of participants
- The co-operating institutions (Council of Europe and European Commission): the partnership, role in European Citizenship, support offered to youth work

Besides these concepts and themes, the T-kit seminar also focused on **youth work in general**, in addressing the following aspects:

- Multiplication
- Non-formal education
- Partnership
- Incorporating a European citizenship dimension into my youth work

Of course, T-kit 7 and how to use it played a central role in the seminar's programme

Using T-Kit 7: Under Construction -Citizenship, Youth and Europe

Incorporating elements / contents into my youth work

Methods

The above concepts and themes, the issue of youth work in general and the use of the T-kit as an educational resource were woven into the programme of the seminar using a set of methods and a certain methodology, as described below.

Methodology & methods

The main methodology used in order to ensure that the learning objectives of the seminars were made achievable was to use the group as a resource, focussing on context and personal experience, contrasting ideas and frameworks, and utilising the T-kit as a reference, resource and focus.

With regard to the different methods used during the various sessions, these included discussion groups, interactive theoretical inputs with buzz-groups, practical group work, individual reflection and application of tips on how to use the T-kit.

Programme flow

As with every training or seminar module, the process initiated with an introduction to the rationale and concept of the seminar, the aims and learning objectives and the methodology and methods used. This was followed by some ice-breakers and group building activities. Once these preliminaries had been dealt with, participants and team moved onto the main contents of the programme, which took the form of a series of sessions that engaged with the theme of the seminar from different angles and which followed a coherent sequence, each subsequent session building on the previous one.

After an initial “warm- up” on the theme, our starting point was to approach citizenship from a personal angle, a citizenship which emanates from our senses of belonging. Following this, we then tackled some controversial ideas about what citizenship means and where we stood on them and why. The next session saw participants return to the newspapers they had brought with them from home and which served as a red thread running through the whole seminar. In groups the participants chose articles which most reflected some important aspects of citizenship

to them, using the categories rights, duties, privileges and identity and participation as a basis. This was followed by an interactive input with buzz-groups on the philosophical and political models of citizenship.

Equipped with these exploratory inceptions into the theme, and following the pattern that was increasingly emerging, namely that European citizenship is indeed something under construction, as the T-kit title suggests, the next step was to “construct” a puzzle with all the complementary and contradictory elements pertaining to a definition of citizenship that had been gathered so far. This puzzle featured a set of pieces that represented the political framework of European Citizenship, each piece of this set corresponding to an existing institutional document or instrument, on which the political project of European Citizenship is constructed and pursued. Other pieces of the puzzle represented different philosophical takes on what European Citizenship should contain, signify and symbolise. And yet other pieces of the puzzle represented the personal ideologies of the participants, who outlined what they would like to prioritise as the defining elements of European Citizenship. After the comprehensive puzzle had been completed, the participants were invited to link their work with young people to the puzzle before them; in other words, a call to recognise the relevance of European Citizenship to their work. They were requested to find an issue related to European Citizenship which they address in their youth work, to say what their response to that issue is, and why they chose that response as the most effective response.

The following step was to become more closely acquainted with the T-kit, its contents and how to use them. There was an input on the rationale of the T-kit as an educational resource; tips for adaptation to a youth work context were given, several relevant parts of the T-kit were flagged and the participants were given the opportunity to practice how to use the T-kit, by using the European Citizenship Education Matrix (pages 64-5 of the T-kit) and applying it to a youth project they are currently working on.

At this stage, the short seminar was almost at an end. After an input on the future training activities of the Partnership programme on European Citizenship, participants were invited to reflect back on the previous days and on the process they had gone through, in order to establish what open questions they still had after 3 days of seminar. These questions were then taken and formulated to provide the basis for a series of questions to be debated in the Polish Parliament with two other youth groups, within the scope of the 2nd European Youth Summit, being held in Warsaw on 15th- 16th May 2005. This final debate was foreseen as the culmination of the pedagogical process which the participants had gone through and an opportunity to debate the questions that had crystallised and had been put into perspective during the short seminar.

Seminar programme as executed

Date	Time	Topic	Key content aspects
11 May Chair: Laszlo	<i>Session 1</i> 14.30- 17.00	Welcome lunch	Getting to know each other
		Opening Introductory exercises with Rouzanna	Objectives of the seminar Group building Europe, youth and me as a youth worker
	<i>Session 2</i> 17.30-19.00	European Citizenship in my work (Newspaper exercise I) with Gavan	Identification of expectations Opening up the theme through the participants' newspapers
12 May Chair: Rouzanna	<i>Session 3</i> 9.45- 11.15	Concepts of European Citizenship Identity molecule exercise with Gavan	Specific reference to relevant T-kit 7 elements
	<i>Session 4</i> 11.45-13.00	Statement exercise with Yael	
	<i>Session 5</i> 15.00- 17.00	(Newspaper exercise II): in groups, working on European Citizenship according to RIGHTS, DUTIES, PARTICIPATION AND PRIVILEGE/IDENTITY with Laszlo	
	<i>Session 6</i> 17.30-19.00	INTERACTIVE INPUT ON European Citizenship by Gavan with buzz-groups	
13 May Chair: Gavan	<i>Session 7</i> 9.30- 11.15	Exercise on European Citizenship Puzzle with Laszlo/ whole team	Non-formal education
	<i>Session 8</i> 11.45- 13.00	Youth work practices linking your youth work to the puzzle of European Citizenship- issue, response, reason with Gavan	Added value of European Citizenship in your work
	<i>Session 9</i> 15.00-19.00	T-Kit 7: Under Construction - Youth, Europe and Citizenship with Yael	Tips for the adaptation of T-kit 7 to the youth work context of participants
14 May Chair: Yael	<i>Session 10</i> 9.00- 10.00	Debriefing of the European Citizenship Education matrix with Yael	
	<i>Session 11</i> 10.00-11.30	Individual conclusion exercise with Laszlo	Questions for concluding discussion Further EC training events and resources
	<i>Session 12</i> 14.30-17.30	Concluding discussion in framework of the 2 nd European Youth Summit (World café) with Gavan	
	<i>Session 13</i> 19.00-22.00	Evaluation (menu) with Rouzanna	

Detailed session outlines - (For the purposes of brevity, please note that in parts of the session outlines European Citizenship is referred to as EC.)

Session outline 1 TITLE:	Introductory session - opening and getting to know each other
ANIMATORS	Whole Team Chair of the day: Laszlo
DATE AND TIME	11th May 2005, 14.30 - 17.30
AIMS & OBJECTIVES	To provide participants with the opportunity to get to know each other, express their expectations and learn about the framework within which the seminar was organised
METHOD(S) USED	<p>During Lunch: Name game Participants were asked to complete the sentences :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • my name is • I come from • At home for lunch I usually eat <p>From 3.30 pm in Plenary:</p> <p>Official opening by Laszlo Földi for the Partnership and Renata Sobolewska for the Polish National Agency</p> <p>Introduction to the seminar's political and institutional background and rationale, and to the Partnership Framework</p> <p>Introduction to the aims and objectives of the seminar, its methodology and the types of methods to be used and its proposed programme</p> <p>Further introductions to the team and their background and roles</p> <p>Further introduction to participants</p> <p>Exercise on participants expectations using a rotating discussion method addressing the following three questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you hope to gain from this seminar for your youth work? • What would like to learn about European Citizenship and why? • What questions do you have about using the t-kit on Citizenship that you want to answer at this seminar?

RESULTS

Process results:

- Participants got to know each other and broke the ice
- They got to know the framework within which the seminar is organised
- They were introduced to the aims, objectives and programme of the seminar in detail
- They were able to exchange their ideas on what they wanted to learn and take from the seminar
- They were able to ask their main questions and express any concerns they had
- They were introduced to the main actors of the activity

Contents results:

Participants listed their expectations, as follows:

What do you hope to gain from this seminar for your youth work?

- “new contacts, potential partners, networking”
- “new and different approaches, methodology”
- “ideas for new projects”
- “intercultural communication skills (tolerance, active listening)”
- “different applicable dimensions of European Citizenship with educational input”
- “skills in sparking curiosity in youngsters on the theme (transmission)”

What would like to learn about European Citizenship and why?

- “How to promote the European Citizenship concept”
- “The role of European Citizenship in the European integration project”
- “Hear and learn different arguments on European Citizenship”
- “Official formulations of the concept of European Citizenship from the CoE or the E.U.”
- “Privileges and responsibilities as a European Citizen”
- “Relationship between national/personal identity and European Citizenship”
- “To learn and share how to participate and engage in the construction of European Citizenship”
- “Deepening our understanding of the concept”
- “Role of participatory democracy in European Citizenship”
- “Historical and cultural references in the construction of European Citizenship”
- “Differences/similarities between national and European citizenships”

What questions do you have about using the T-kit on Citizenship that you want to answer at this seminar?

- “We will see (ask after the seminar)”
- “How to use it?”
- “How to make young people interested in the T-kit”
- “What should and can be achieved with it?”
- “Role plays, case studies”
- “How to train local trainers”
- “Who is the target group? Who should be using it?”
- “What languages is the T-kit available in?”

COMMENTS	<p>Only 13 participants of 19 had arrived in time to take part in this introductory session.</p> <p>In the debriefing of this exercise, the participants were reminded that this is a seminar and not a training course; thus some of their expectations (especially regarding skills) would not be directly catered for.</p> <p>As you can see from the results, the participants had some very ambitious expectations, some of which could not realistically be fulfilled in the 3 and half days of the seminar and were unrelated to the actual learning objectives of the seminar</p>
SUPPORTING MATERIALS USED	Flip charts

Session outline 2 TITLE:	Getting into the topic of citizenship
ANIMATORS	Gavan
DATE AND TIME	11th May 2005, 17.30 - 19.00
AIMS & OBJECTIVES	To explore with participants the issues that they are dealing with in youth work that are relevant to the way they understand citizenship
METHOD(S) USED	<p>Making a chain of issues</p> <p>Individually participants were asked to look at the daily or local newspaper they brought from home and to find one article which describes for them an issue related to citizenship and which has relevance for the work they do with young people. The first person described the content of their article, the relation it has to the citizenship issue and to the work they are doing with young people. When another participant found a link between their issue and the one just described, they moved to sit beside the person who has just presented, to make a chain of different issues related to citizenship.</p> <p>At the same time, one facilitator was noting up the issues described and the way in which it is related to citizenship and the links between the different issues.</p>

RESULTS

Process results:

- Participants were able to get an overview of the issues they are working with in relation to both citizenship and young people
- Participants had the chance to begin to explore the issue of citizenship and its complexity
- Participants started to think about the concept of citizenship in relation to their own personal experience, the place where they live and the young people they work with

Summary of issues identified

Issues	Relation to citizenship	
Democratic protest and participation	Rights - civil and political	
Participation and representation of disadvantaged Groups	Minorities / Immigrants Participation in civic life Community, cohesion Feeling of belonging	
Lack of interest of youth in politics	Crisis of participation in democratic politics	
European Constitution	Importance of citizen knowledge and participation in drafting and ratification Liberal vs. social visions of Europe	
Civic disobedience and protest in the face of things people don't agree with	Right of association Accountability of political representatives	
Rise of neo-Nazi / neo-Fascist and protest against Memory of painful past events	Effective civic action "Power of the people" Awareness of above in wider society Memory as the basis for the future	
Lack of confidence in existing political elites/representatives	Problem of trust Corruption Lack of political awareness	
Political independence, sovereignty, influence of other countries	Democracy as a vision. Youth role in democratization, regime change, "the true nature of democracy"	
Facing the past, overcoming the dictatorial past	Reconciliation as a pre-requisite	
Access to reliable information Independence of information	Problems of good governance	
Decision to deposit nuclear waste without consultation of the citizens	Transparency of political decisions Rights of citizens to oppose and criticize "bad" decisions of political elites	
Social / economic problems among youth	Some problems particularly affect youth	
Lack of hope among youth Suicide	Disproportionate negative effects Problem of apathy	

COMMENTS	<p>The exercise made a very personal link between current affairs, social issues, their own conception of citizenship and the youth work that they do.</p> <p>The team were able to identify during this session which participants had more difficulty with communicating in English and thus devised an approach to accommodate for this.</p>
SUPPORTING MATERIALS USED	Local and daily newspapers from the countries and cities where participants live in a variety of different languages.

Session outline 3 TITLE:	Identity molecule exercise
ANIMATORS	Gavan
DATE AND TIME	12th May 2005, 9.45 - 11.15
BACKGROUND	<p>This whole day of the seminar concentrated on exploring the different understandings of European citizenship using different methods/approaches, represented by four separate sessions.</p> <p>This session will approach the issue of European Citizenship through a discussion of identity in personal and social terms, the relation of identity to privilege and discrimination, and the further relation of this to citizenship and participation. The following sessions today (sessions 4, 5 and 6) will move gradually from the personal, more emotive relationship towards citizenship to more general citizenship issues and debates on the nature of citizenship (theory).</p>
AIMS & OBJECTIVES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To make a link between identity and citizenship • To allow participants become aware of the complex nature of citizenship and recognise the personal dimension • To serve as a basis on which to tackle more abstract concepts

<p>METHOD(S) USED</p>	<p>Exploring one's own identity by drawing a molecule, made up of an inner and outer circle of atoms (identity indicators)</p> <p>The animator first explained the exercise by creating and explaining his own identity molecule in three steps. Participants then followed steps 1-3 individually.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Put 5 indicators of how you identify yourself, thus creating the inner circle of the molecule 2. Add elements that represent aspects of your identity that can be used to identify you but which you do not necessarily see as essential to your self-identity (Thus this "outer circle" is further away from the core) 3. Draw an outline according to whether each indicator generally brings you privilege or not. <p>The participants were then split into groups for facilitated discussion of the following questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How does this molecule relate to your lived experience of citizenship? 2. How does this molecule relate to the youth work that you do?
<p>RESULTS</p>	<p>Process results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants were able to reflect on their own identity. • Participants could recognise and differentiate between indicators of self-identity and indicators of "assigned" identity • Participants could reflect on and express with the group in what way their identity related to how they lived their citizenship • Participants could reflect and express with the group how their identity related to their youth work • Participants recognised how their youth work is an expression of their citizenship. <p>Some interesting points raised:</p> <p>Some participants recognised how their self-identity revolves to a large extent around their values and how this is linked to their motivation for being involved in the youth work they do.</p> <p>One participant pointed out how privileged she felt to be able to dedicate herself to working in an area that relates to and reinforces a part of her "chosen" or "preferred" identity.</p> <p>Several participants were surprised to realise how one identity indicator (i.e. being a woman, being young or being single) could be perceived as a great advantage according to their own inner personal sentiment and criteria, but assessed in terms of social "external" realities, it could be considered a great disadvantage.</p>
<p>COMMENTS</p>	<p>Although ice was not yet fully broken and participants were reticent to engage with the task on a very personal level, the exercise served to ignite the participants' thinking processes</p>

Session outline 4 TITLE:	Statements and positions on European citizenship
ANIMATORS	Yael
DATE AND TIME	12 th May 11.45 -13.00
AIMS & OBJECTIVES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To engage with controversial aspects of citizenship in general and European Citizenship in particular • To highlight through the statements and the reactions thereto the point about European Citizenship being “under construction”
METHOD(S) USED	<p>A line was drawn dividing the plenary room in two sides, one marked with a positive sign and the other with a minus sign. Participants were asked to position themselves on either side of the line according to their agreement or disagreement with a number of statements regarding citizenship in general and European citizenship in particular. After all participants have taken their position, the floor is given to whoever would like to comment on their choice of position in relation to the given statement. Participants were encouraged to give their opinion on the opinion of others.</p> <p>The exercise was self-facilitated to the extent possible and participants had exactly 8 minutes for each statement.</p> <p>The exercise was followed by a debriefing session</p> <p>The statements were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Citizenship should be based on residence instead of birth or blood - The state has a duty to take care of its citizens - Immigrants to a new country should participate in citizenship classes - You can be European Citizen only if you are a citizen of an EU member state - You can only be an active citizen if you can afford - There is no citizenship without discrimination <p>The questions posed during the debriefing were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What did you like / dislike about the exercise? - Was it difficult to make a decision about where to stand? If yes, why? - Which criteria did you use to make your decision about where to stand? <p>Which dimensions of citizenship have been raised in the discussion of the statements?</p> <p>Did you discover any other ways of looking at the issue of citizenship during the discussion? If so, did any of these different perspectives surprise you?</p>

<p>RESULTS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants could engage in a debate on controversial statements about citizenship and European citizenship • Below are some of the opinions and interesting issues raised by participants regarding each statement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizenship should be based on residence instead of birth or Blood <p>“Where you reside, affects your participation, you participate in the place you live”.</p> <p>If viewed in terms of residence, we must not forget the excluding mechanism of having or not having “residency” status.</p> <p>“If you have been born in a place with a family heritage, this enhances your connection to your place of residence, and enhances your willingness to participate”</p> <p>“If you choose to be a resident of a certain area, you must take on the responsibility of that choice, in terms of community participation”.</p> • The state has a duty to take care of its citizens <p>“The state has a duty to <i>create the best conditions</i> for citizens”</p> <p>“The state is the citizens. Institutions representing citizens are filled with citizens and elected by citizens”</p> <p>“e.g. communist countries, now much more chances for self-realisation, enhances creativity to make own choices”</p> <p>“The state should facilitate the structure, establish mechanisms, provide resources but it does not mean that it must think or act for citizens”</p> • Immigrants to a new country should participate in citizenship classes <p>“Not should, have the opportunity to, yes”</p> <p>“Yes, if these classes include information on the rights and status of individuals” (status of women in Germany in relation to Turks and honour-killing)</p> <p>“Yes, if they are not demagogical but transmit values, and are a source of information for them to know what they can pursue (people who share the values- if you come to a country and want to be a part of it, it means you identity with the values of that country)</p> <p>“No- perception by the immigrants as something ideological, propaganda”</p> • You can only be an active citizen if you can afford it <p>“Yes, state of citizenship not given, it is created, earned so you must have the resources to “create” and be an active citizen”</p> <p>“Which resources do they need to be a citizen and in which quantity? Nobody can answer this question. Some people have many resources but they do not participate, others participate with no resources- just a wish”</p> • You can be a European Citizen only if you are a citizen of an EU member state <p>“It would be nice if it could be anyone who identifies with European values”</p> <p>“Question of values and not the area you are living in”</p> <p>“I have felt European long before Finland became an EU member”</p>
-----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no citizenship without discrimination <p>“In the case of those changing their citizenship, yes - especially if someone applies and is denied... not all applicants are on the same level and this in itself is discriminatory” “There are always some people left out of the picture because to define citizenship always excludes”</p> <p>DEBRIEFING:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What did you like / dislike about the exercise? <p>“Frustrating not having choice outside of yes or no” “Waste of time because a common understanding does not emerge” “Provocative which is at first frustrating, but makes you reflect” “I liked it because it reflects life- often there are black and white rules, but we as youth workers want to create grey areas”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was it difficult to make a decision about where to stand? If yes, why? • Which criteria did you use to make your decision about where to stand? <p>“My criteria were my scale of values- what concerns me and what I think should concern other people” “My criteria were based to some extent on history - the statement on citizenship classes reminded of ideological classes of Marxism during the Soviet Union era” “ I tried to put myself in the shoes of a person affected by these statements, e.g. an immigrant for example”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which issues raised in the discussion of the statements are most relevant for the young people you work with? In which ways / why? <p>“Immigration- because now we are becoming a multi-cultural society. If people do not understand something, they become intolerant very quickly” “Discrimination/ social injustice” “Cross-cultural cooperation (working on inherited prejudices regarding other cultures- this inhibits promotion of an European citizenship)”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you consider to be the most important aspect of the citizenship raised in the discussion? • Active participation • Emotional aspect. Solidarity • How to harmonise legal status with practical status • Why do you think the issue of citizenship is so emotional <p>“It touches our identity. If identity is questioned, we become defensive” “We assume that there are certain things that combine us. We have our beliefs but we do not realise always that the others have different belief systems and values. How to harmonise these?”</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Session outline 5 TITLE:	Newspaper articles related to issues of European Citizenship
ANIMATORS	Laszlo
DATE AND TIME	12 th May 15.00-17.00
BACKGROUND	One of the most important dimensions of European Citizenship is to connect the idea to present day social, political, cultural and economic processes and action. Thus it is important to analyse the relevant newspaper articles with a critical and cautious attitude.
AIMS & OBJECTIVES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introducing the participants to the more systematic aspects of citizenship • Encouraging participants to structure and articulate their understanding of citizenship according to 4 essential categories: rights, duties, participation and privilege and identity.
METHOD(S) USED	<p>The participants were first divided into 4 groups. Different coloured spots were placed arbitrarily on the backs of the participants, who then endeavoured to find the others with the same coloured spots, without talking.</p> <p>In non-facilitated groups, participants were asked to choose articles from the newspapers they had brought with them to the seminar on the basis of what best expressed their understanding of citizenship and particular aspects of it.</p> <p>Each group however was assigned a different aspect of citizenship under which to categorise their understanding thereof.</p> <p>The four categories were as follows: Rights Duties Participation Privilege and identity</p> <p>The groups were advised by the team to start by getting a group understanding of the terms before comparing chosen articles and discussing the aspect of their category addressed in one of these articles.</p> <p>The groups each prepared a presentation to relay their results back to the plenary and open it up for discussion</p>

<p>RESULTS</p>	<p>The group on rights had chosen an article on a Neo-Nazi demo and a counter demo on the anniversary of the end of WWII. The discussion centred on the right to freedom of expression even if what is being expressed is taboo or goes against root values. The group discussed their views on censorship, ideologies and the difference between participative rights and representative rights</p> <p>The group on duties (of citizens) had chosen an article in which the president of Georgia speaks about the changing democracy in his country. The group did not reach a consensus on the term “duty”. Instead, they generated a whole series of questions around it: How to relate to the concept? Duty as something ethical or a legal term? But can you really articulate the following as duties? - Enhance, promote and guard individual and collective liberties, human dignity, solidarity, tolerance, public access to info, services, participation, policy making, decision making...</p> <p>The group on participation had chosen an article on a Swedish Feminist party that was being formed in time for the 2006 elections. Debate centred on the relationship between politics, power and participation. Formation of a new party brings politics and participation into the public eye. So does this lead to more participation? Participation of women in politics: Why vote for a woman candidate who does not promote your agenda - who has to prove something to whom? What is the complexity we allow people in the public eye to have?</p> <p>The group on privileges and identity had chosen an article about triumph of Gavino Sale, leader of the Sardinian separatist party. They discussed the relationship between your identity and the privileges it brings with it. In the case of Sale, his identity as a Sardinian citizen fighting for the self-determination of the Sards, and having the support of the popular vote, privileges him, in that he is revered as the “Che Guevara” of Sardinia. In this context, he is privileged to fight for and defend the dream of a minority. In another context, with altered identity and circumstances, he would not have this privilege.</p>
<p>SUPPORTING MATERIALS USED</p>	<p>Participants used their newspapers Flip charts</p>

Session outline 6 TITLE:	Input on Europe citizenship
ANIMATORS	Gavan
DATE AND TIME	12 th May 17.30-19.00
AIMS & OBJECTIVES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To identify the main aspects of citizenship • To discover different perspectives of European Citizenship issues • The bases of citizenship: belonging, legitimacy, entitlement • Philosophies of citizenship
METHOD(S) USED	<p>Main elements, interspersed with buzz groups and time for discussion and clarification on each element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why citizenship? Current debates... - The bases of citizenship: belonging, legitimacy, entitlement - Philosophies of citizenship - European citizenship? <p>Closing - flagging the references in the t-kit p. 1-43</p>
RESULTS	<p>Process results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main aspects of citizenship were analysed and participants could take part in a collective in-depth questioning of the main concepts. • The main models of citizenship were introduced and examples were given of nations where these models or elements thereof are in use. • Participants were able to understand the theoretical input in context through small buzz-groups of reflection and discussion. <p>Content results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For an overview of this input, see the photos below. <p>Regarding the buzz group work, participants were asked to discuss certain aspects of the theories touched upon. E.g. in the framework of the liberal citizenship theory, they were asked to discuss the recently introduced smoking ban in public spaces in Ireland</p> <p>Another buzz group question was "What are the current debates about rights that exist, in your context, and who is involved in these debates?"</p>

RESULTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children's rights-protection and realization. • Human rights and asylum (who defends me from the defenders?) • Immigrants' rights and which ones? • Privacy-state collection of information and which sources? • Abortion. • Violence, media and state regulation. • Right of research (genetic). • Right of state to listen in private conversations • Same sex unions? Civil union? <p>Another buzz group question focused on what elements of the different citizenship models discussed (or different elements thereof) did participants recognize at play/work in the sphere where they live and work?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Germany: elements of civic republicanism, but asks the question "what is the next model? Because multiculturalism, etc. did not work" (in reference to the Turkish minority in Germany) • Portugal: still many elements of conservative communitarianism • Romania: elements of different models overlapping but in parts more hegemonic.
----------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

"CITIZENSHIP AS A
MEMBERSHIP OF A
POLITICAL COMMUNITY INVOLVES
A SET OF RELATIONSHIPS
BETWEEN RIGHTS, DUTIES,
PARTICIPATION AND IDENTITY

RELATIONSHIPS ARE — FELT (EMOTIONAL)
— IDEOLOGICAL
— INSTITUTIONAL
— SOCIO-CULTURAL
— imagined
— POLITICAL
— HISTORICAL
— DYNAMIC

Rights-based model
guaranteeing autonomy
of the individual:



FREEDOM
FROM / FREEDOM
TO

⌞ ⌞ RIGHTS → DUTIES

STATE?

NEUTRAL

(no concept
of common
good)

UNIVERSAL

(equality
of individuals)

Rights?

T. H. MARSHALL

CITIZENSHIP AND
SOCIAL CLASS (1950)

CIVIL

- freedom of
conscience

CITIZEN-
SHIP AS
STATUS NOT
AS A DEMOCRATIC
ROLE

Assembly
property ownership
speech

Rights secured through
process of justice

POLITICAL

CITIZENSHIP IN
RELATION TO
POLITICAL REPRESENTATION
AND PARTICIPATION

SOCIAL

→ RECOGNISING
DIFFERENCE
BETWEEN
FORMAL AND
SUBSTANTIVE
EQUALITY

POLITICAL COMMUNITY IS ANCHORED IN PRIOR CULTURAL COMMUNITY....

CONSERVATIVE COMMUNITARIANISM



NATIONAL IDENTITY
IS CENTRAL



ROOTS OF
COMMUNITY IN
FAMILY, RELIGION,
TRADITION, NATION



COMMUNITY
ROOTED IN TIME,
PLACE AND CONTINUITY

LIBERAL COMMUNITARIANISM



Recognition
of difference
and cultural
community in
a shared
political
space



DUTIES OF
MAJORITIES
AND MINORITIES



PHILOSOPHIES OF
ASSIMILATION AND
INTEGRATION

CIVIC REPUBLICANISM



identity
sustained
through civic
bonds in
a public
sphere



COMMITMENT
TO NOTIONS
OF THE
PUBLIC,
PUBLIC SELF
AND PUBLIC
INTEREST

CRITIQUES OF THE "INDIVIDUAL" AND "THE COMMUNITY"

UNIVERSALITY AND NEUTRALITY = MYTH AND
(FORMAL EQUALITY) (NO SPECIAL RECOGNITION)

FEMINISMS - ROLE OF PATRIARCHY IN
PRODUCING HISTORICAL-SOCIAL
NORMATIVES [EXAMPLE: PUBLIC/PRIVATE]

SUBSTANTIVE EQUALITY IMPLIES
ACCESS AND EQUALITY OF
OPPORTUNITY



MULTICULTURAL COMMUNITIES?

- WHO RECOGNISES DIFFERENCE?
- US/THEM FREEZES IDENTITIES, DIFFERENCES, AND CENTRES A SIMPLISTIC IDEA OF DIFFERENCE
- CULTURE AS A LIMITING POLITICAL IDEA
 - MULTIPLE IDENTITIES?
 - MULTIPLE BELONGING?
 - POWER AND GENDER, AGE, SEXUALITY, POLITICS
- REAL CHANGE?
 - TOP-DOWN SOCIAL MANAGEMENT
 - naive about right-wing strategies
 - ANTI-RACISM BECOMES "RESPECTING CULTURES"

CITIZENSHIPS?

Legal-political:

relationships
between local,
regional, national,
international,
institutions

Participation

multi-layered

↳ global citizenship?

↳ environmental
citizenship?

↳ EUROPEAN
CITIZENSHIP?

↳ transnational
communities
and networks?

IDENTITY

shifting
perceptions
and politics
of
belonging

legitimacy
entitlement

FKIT: "CITIZENSHIP IN
EUROPE" Pp 9-31

• "OUR Conceptual Framework"
Pp 31-43

Session outline 7 TITLE:	Constructing a puzzle of European Citizenship
ANIMATORS	Laszlo
DATE AND TIME	13th May 9.30-11.15
BACKGROUND	For the CoE and the European Commission, European Citizenship is an important theme in terms of their political agenda and both institutions have published several documents on European Citizenship. It is important that the participants have the overall picture of the existing political framework so that they can later research more details on their own.
AIMS & OBJECTIVES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To explore the different aspects of European Citizenship • To learn about the different administrative and political aspects of European Citizenship at the two institutions, • To discuss the personal experience and attitude connected to the idea of European Citizenship, • To describe the visions and expectations of participants about European Citizenship,
METHOD(S) USED	<p>Many identical puzzle pieces are made. Each team member writes something relevant to European Citizenship, each from a different angle</p> <p>Yael and Laszlo: institutional-political Gavan: philosophical- Europe and European Citizenship as relative and changing ideas in different nation states Rouzanna: personal-philosophical (see photo of puzzle below)</p> <p>Participants were divided into 4 groups and each group had 5 puzzle pieces to complete and add to the puzzle and comment thereon</p>
RESULTS	<p>Process results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group came up with collective expectations and discussed their personal attitude to the construction of Europe and its Citizenship. <p>Content results:</p> <p>Group 1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Religion and culture (history and heritage) 2. Institution of rights and values, in order to strengthen democracy (superiority, "enlightened", colonization) 3. Respect, tolerance, solidarity and peaceful values (non-violence) 4. Standard definition (dictionary): territory (Roman/Greek) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question of former colonies was discussed (do they feel European in Martinique?) • Topic of religion sparked a debate on the heritage left by Christianity and Islam and their place within the framework of European Citizenship

<p>RESULTS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some drew attention to the perception of a dominant culture in Europe and warned about its consequences (Europe's future doomed) • Criticism of presence of attitude of superiority (our values are better - what makes them ours? = democratization of Iraq) • How to find the lowest common denominator to create a framework for peace if there are different and sometimes conflicting notions of life, honour, etc.? • E.g. Should Turks have the right to perform honour killings in Germany? Would as "Rechtsstaat" be the answer? • Participant from Ukraine: Easy for an EU member to have idealized versions of citizenship, but Portugal has freedom of movement, Ukraine doesn't, so how can they in Ukraine feel like European citizens <p>Group 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Harmonisation between local customs and EU rules e.g. If Romania becomes a member, must change norms regarding pig killing - electric shocks instead of the traditional method (contradiction: EU promotes preserving local traditions, etc. but then prevents this by implementing certain rules) 2. Different attitudes of EU citizens towards an EU concept - what to do with these misfits? 3. Stereotypes and myths between new and old member states 4. Complexity of EU structures/- understanding of European Citizenship by "simple" folk (confusion about what these theories or institutional frameworks mean) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minorities are not represented in EU institutions. • European Citizenship is not the same as EU citizenship • But people must know their rights (i.e. drawn up by the institutions) in order to be a true citizen • "Romania is not ready to join the EU: it is not all bread and honey, it is a lot of responsibility (people just think of the "funding benefits", not of regulations or taxes)" • "Educated elite discussing concepts while wide public don't even understand the terminology- • We must accept that people also have the right not to be involved, not to participate as active citizens in decision making, monitoring policy, advocacy, lobbying etc. <p>Group 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. provide secure and peaceful, stable environment (Never again principle) 2. enforce transparency and clear structures that are enforced (to combat corruption- Albania) 3. Right to move and reside without any constraints 4. Free market for European entrepreneurship <p>Group 4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Definition measurability uniformity (concept is so intangible). Will we end up with A, B, C class citizens? 2. Enhance multicultural society through educational policy- attend the needs of each culture (our right and duty and privilege- European constitution could help to instrumentalise it) 3. Horizontal existence of cultural heritage and references (no dominant cultures) (should be incorporated into the concept of European Citizenship) 4. Existing instruments should be used as a framework (ECHR, UDHR, EUGHR)
<p>SUPPORTING MATERIALS USED</p>	<p>See the list of web pages and other reference material.</p>

DUCTION

EUROPE AND
EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP
AS RELATIVES
AND CHANGING IDEAS
IN DIFFERENT
NATION-STATES

ECHR

Universal appli-
cation on entire
territory

ECC

regulates cultural
cooperation
between states

Territory

- Roman / Greek
- Former colonies

Green Paper on the
future of democracy in
Europe

identifies challenges
opportunities
impact on citizenship
EU

refers to

PA focus on participation of minority
groups

- considers specific
barriers
- guide for action

to provide secure
approach to
stable
situation

WHITE PAPER
ON
YOUTH POLICY

Europe and
European citizenship
as a cultural project

Top-down? Bottom-up?

Culture
+ Religion

history
today

EUROPE AS A
CLOSED OR OPEN
IDEA RESULTING
IN NARROW OR
BROAD IDEAS OF
CITIZEN

RIGHT TO
FREE MOVEMENT
WITHIN THE
EU

EUROPEAN UNION
GUIDELINES ON
HUMAN RIGHTS

A tradition of rights + an
order to strengthen
democracy

Respect, tolerance,
solidarity &
peaceful values
(non-violence)

EUROPEAN
CONSTITUTION

FUNDAMENTAL
RIGHTS OF
THE CITIZENS OF
THE EU

free
market
in
European
entrepreneurship

HARMONISATION
BETWEEN
LOCAL CUSTOMS
&
EU RULES

The complexity of EU
structures
The understanding
of EU citizenship by
simple citizens
EU as a
theory

EUROPE AND
EUROPEAN
CITIZENSHIP
ANDREW IN A
COMMITMENT TO
"NEVER AGAIN"

EUROPEAN
CITIZENSHIP
AS A "CORE"

Session outline 8 TITLE:	Relevance of European Citizenship to youth work		
ANIMATORS	Gavan		
DATE AND TIME	13 th May 11.45-13.00		
BACKGROUND	The exercise 'Puzzle of European Citizenship' brought together a series of political, philosophical and institutional/organisational notions and associations with European citizenship. This exercise provided a bridge to the actual practice of the participants, and how some of these issues and ideas are relevant to their youth work		
AIMS & OBJECTIVES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To evaluate the relevance of specific aspects of European citizenship as discussed in session 7 to the current and ongoing youth work of the participants 		
METHOD(S) USED	<p>Each group was asked to share and discuss their ongoing youth work, and to facilitate each other in exploring the explicit and implicit links of this work to the issues discussed under 'European citizenship'.</p> <p>To do this they were provided with a flipchart divided into 3 columns: <i>Issue</i> (chosen from the puzzle on the wall) <i>Response</i> (how their youth work is engaging with this) and <i>Reason</i> (why have they and/or their organisation chosen this activity or intervention?)</p> <p>Participants were advised to really concentrate on the specific reasons for an activity, and not to rely on organizational logic or rhetoric, or on assumed reasons (e.g. not: we do youth exchanges because it increases tolerance - this is an assumption not a reason)</p>		
RESULTS	ISSUE	RESPONSE	REASON
	Multicultural society	Intercultural learning, seminars, training, exchanges, learning by doing, applied researches,	Acknowledgement of diversity
	EU enlargement/ integration	inside-outside EU dialogue - networking	Conflict prevention and transformation
	Promoting EC values	Mass media special campaigns	Promotion of peace, Involve youth from non-EU member states in the construction of European identities
	Active participation and political awareness	Workshops and seminars for school and university students	Raise awareness on people's rights
			Believe in the importance of a vivid democracy

Session outline 9 TITLE:	Introduction to the T-kit and how to use it
ANIMATORS	Yael
DATE AND TIME	13 th May 15.00-19.00 Debriefing of session 14 th May 9.00-10.00 (see session outline 10)
AIMS & OBJECTIVES	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To look at how the t-kit was conceptualised as a tool for NFE activities on European Citizenship - not a manual but a guide for working with the subject 2. To help participants to find the most relevant parts of the t-kit for them <p>To provide some concrete tips on how to adapt the material included for use in their youth work</p>
METHOD(S) USED	<p>Input to clarify the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - main aim and target group of the t-kit <p>Aim of the t-kit: To help people who are working with young people in Europe to develop activities on the theme of European citizenship as a framework and as a subject or theme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approach to the task of preparing the t-kit taken by the team <p>The team chose an approach based on the following principles: no recipes, “improvisation cuisine”, raise questions and curiosity, offer support for experimentation, idea of “under construction”.</p> <p>3 areas (interlinked) were to be explored:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concepts and practices of Citizenship and European Citizenship - concepts and practices of education for Citizenship and European Citizenship - both of the above in relation to youth work <p>Introduction to the table of contents</p> <p>Main resources available in the t-kit for working directly with young people: “under construction” activities, questions for further reflection, the “citizenship education” matrix and the examples of citizenship projects (citizenship scenarios).</p> <p>Our conceptual framework (see p.41) introduced in more detail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 main components of the framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Senses of belonging (personal) o 4 dimensions of citizenship (sociological) - 2 main expressions of citizenship: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Interior (private) o Exterior (public)

<p>METHOD(S) USED -CONTD.</p>	<p>This is a concept which is dynamic, integral and complex.</p> <p>In relation to youth work and non-formal education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The above concept is designed to challenge youth workers to engage in the process of reshaping the practise of youth work as a provocation to the status quo, as socially and politically constructive and as empowering young people to become actors of change. - The idea of education of European Citizenship is about developing competence for acting and being a citizen and involves working on developing knowledge, skills and attitudes in relation to specific values. <p>Task:</p> <p>In order to make relevant groups for working with the t-kit, participants were asked:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - who has a concrete project coming up on the theme of E.C or where E.C is the framework? - who is working on similar issues, does not have a project as such and would like to join one of the volunteers with a project <p>Introduction to the logic of the citizenship education matrix</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - you want to promote certain values that lie at the heart of the project you are working on (in relation to European Citizenship) - these have informed the identification of the aims of the project - these values have influenced the identification of the learning needs of the participants - the learning needs determine which knowledge, skills and attitudes you will address in your educational activities or the project <p>Using the matrix, the groups are asked to map out the project in terms of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - values - aims - learning needs of participants - knowledge to be taught - skills to be developed - attitudes to be developed <p>On this basis the groups were asked to identify potential activities which might fulfil the objectives of the project and which could develop the knowledge, skills and attitudes that have been identified as crucial. The groups were then asked to assess which parts of the t-kit and which resources in it are most useful or relevant for the activities identified and why?</p>
<p>RESULTS</p>	<p>Process results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The participants were introduced to the logic and content of the t-kit framework - They were given some idea of how it could be used and some of the elements which can be relevant for day to day work with young people - Some of the key resources in it were introduced and pointed out <p>Content results: see results of debriefing session on this exercise</p>

COMMENTS	This activity would have benefited if it had ran longer and had longer debriefing, The participants were just beginning to develop their understanding when the exercise had to stop. Such an activity also necessitates that participants actually READ the publication beforehand.
SUPPORTING MATERIALS USED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - pictures of the input - reference to page numbers in the t-kit, if relevant

Session outline 10 TITLE:	Debriefing of Exercise on “How to use the T-kit”
ANIMATORS	Yael
DATE AND TIME	14th May 2005, 09.00 - 10.00
AIMS & OBJECTIVES	<p>To explore with participants and debrief the experience of the exercise on how to use the t-kit which was conducted in groups on the previous afternoon</p> <p>To come to some conclusions on how to use the t-kit in youth work in the future</p>
METHOD(S) USED	<p>A classical debriefing round was undertaken, with Yael introducing linked questions and developing the discussion with participants based on their experiences of the exercise of thinking about and filling in the Citizenship Education Matrix.</p> <p>The following questions were introduced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Was it difficult to fill in the Matrix? Was it a clarifying exercise in relation to the projects described? - Did those who proposed projects learn anything new or useful about or for their project in using the Matrix and discussing with the other participants? If so, what? - How could those who did not propose a project, but joined the work on a project of another participant contribute to the discussion? - In that discussion, which parts of the t-kit did you find the most useful for your reflection on the projects? -

RESULTS	<p>Process results: While most participants, of whom only few were familiar with the t-kit and had not read it before coming to Warsaw, found it difficult to engage with the more intellectual approach of the t-kit and had expected to work with a manual, it was possible for them to access knowledge about how the t-kit was established and in which perspective it can be used in the development of youth work practice. It was difficult for most participants to engage with the holistic nature of the t-kit, as many expected to be told about interesting and useful activities. Nevertheless, the session allowed them to understand the concept of European citizenship further, and to imagine activities where this concept is reflected.</p> <p>Content results:</p> <p>“It was very difficult to identify real values, establish whether it was a value or approach; but it was very useful”</p> <p>“Matrix was difficult to fill out independently but made easier by examples in the T-kit”</p> <p>“I learned something more about the project than I had already assumed”</p> <p>“One often only thinks about the objectives. I gained new insights about skills and knowledge, cross comparing with others”</p> <p>Enormous job actually drafting up the matrix and finding the examples (Yael)</p> <p>Veiled criticism of Council of Europe’s agenda pushed through the T-kit</p>
COMMENTS	It was clear that for this exercise to live up to its true potential, it would have been necessary for participants to work for longer on their own projects.
SUPPORTING MATERIALS USED	A slightly adapted Matrix

Session outline 11 TITLE:	Preparation for Youth Summit discussion- Future perspectives for European Citizenship training
ANIMATORS	Laszlo
DATE AND TIME	14 th May 10.00- 11.30
BACKGROUND	Within the scope of the 2 nd European Youth Summit in Warsaw from 15-16 May 2005, the T-kit seminar participants were invited to engage in a debate on the relevance of European citizenship to youth work with two other youth groups. Delegates of the Youth Summit would be meeting at the Polish Parliament to discuss issues that are important to youth, having a chance to have their voices heard in a meeting of the Council of Europe Summit of Heads of State and Governments

AIMS & OBJECTIVES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To allow participants to reflect on the previous 3 days of the seminar • To identify any “open questions” remaining based on this reflection • To choose some of these questions as the basis for the debate in the Polish parliament within the framework of the 2nd Youth Summit
METHOD(S) USED	<p>The session is divided into two parts. During the first part, participants are invited to sit back and close their eyes and reflect on the past few days as a way of rounding up their conceptualization processes during this seminar. Then the participants had a brainstorming session to express all the unanswered questions that still remained after having almost completed the seminar. Based on all these questions, 4 key questions were formulated to be used as a basis for the discussion to be had in the Polish Parliament that afternoon.</p> <p>During the second part of the session, Laszlo talked about further training opportunities being organised by the Partnership Programme on the theme of European Citizenship, with particular focus on the 6 European Citizenship Modules, of which 3 have been completed. The following 3 will be held in October, November and December 2005.</p>
RESULTS	<p>Process results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 questions were formulated based the many "open questions" which were still remaining for the participants • Participants were informed about the other training activities the Partnership are currently running or have planned on EC • Participants were introduced to some resources on EC <p>Some of the questions that arose: Which legal (institutional frameworks, documents) and philosophical (values) aspects should we take in order to fill the definition? Relationship between European and national identity What should the educational response be? How to keep it simple? How to explain it to my grandma? What is the difference between European and global citizenship? If based on values, then what are those values? Is it based on geography? Challenges for the future? Find out the real values? Find mechanism to involve young people in discussion. Find mechanism to involve disabled or disadvantaged citizens (socially excluded) in this process. Who is invited into the process of defining the framework? Is it inclusive? Is there any alternative to citizen participation?</p>
SUPPORTING MATERIALS USED	<p>Reference made to the partnership’s website (www.training-youth.net) to find all relevant material on upcoming training modules on European Citizenship and publications/documents on the subject in the online library currently under construction, the European Research centre</p>

Session outline 12 TITLE:	World Café- Discussion on the relevance of European citizenship to youth work in the Polish Parliament with 2 other youth groups
ANIMATORS	Gavan Chair of the day: Yael
DATE AND TIME	14th May 2005, 14.30 - 17.30
AIMS & OBJECTIVES	To discuss with external youth groups the open questions on European Citizenship remaining after 3 and half days of the seminar To further reflect on the relevance of European Citizenship to the participants' work with young people. To contribute to the 2 nd Youth Summit with the presentation of the results of the discussion.
METHOD(S) USED	Renata Sobolewska of the Polish National Agency gave the welcome. Laszlo Földi introduced the partnership. World café is a method in which the participants are split into small groups (in this case 3-5 in each group) There were four rounds of discussion at each café table, each round was stimulated by a different question. Each round was 20 minutes long. The following 4 questions were asked: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What meaning does European Citizenship have for me and the young people I work with? • What visions of Europe are important to European citizenship as we would like to see it develop? • What relationships can we develop between our understandings of European Citizenship and global citizenship? • How can European Citizenship become a beneficial framework for the work we do with young people?
RESULTS	Process results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants were able to discuss their open questions with external groups and exchange perspectives. • Participants were able to formulate recommendations based on the outcome of the discussion, which were supposed to be subsequently submitted to the Youth Summit for further discussion Contents results: See appendix no. 5
COMMENTS	After the discussion, we were invited to a buffet where the results of the work of the different sessions were given to the Polish delegates of the Youth Summit.
SUPPORTING MATERIALS USED	Flip charts

Session outline 13 TITLE:	Final evaluation- what's on the menu?
ANIMATORS	Rouzanna
DATE AND TIME	14 th May 19.00-22.00
AIMS & OBJECTIVES	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To identify to what extent, according to the participants, were the learning objectives of the seminar fulfilled. 2. To verify to what extent the seminar responded to the participants expectations outlined during the welcome session. 3. To get feedback from the participants on the different programme elements of the seminar. 4. To close the seminar
METHOD(S) USED	<p>As the setting for the final evaluation session was a restaurant in Warsaw, restaurant terminology and props were used in a creative way to get feedback from the participants on the seminar. There were four separate parts to the evaluation session, each one addressing a different objective (see above)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For objective 1 - a food trolley was placed along a line of paper scotch marked with percentages ranging from 0% at one extreme to 100% at the other. The learning objectives of the seminar were read out one by one. For each objective, the whole group had to decide at what percentage point to place the trolley. 2. For objective 2 - Participants stood in 2 lines, facing each other. In pairs, they used facial expressions to convey to each other to what extent their expectations were met and then explained why 3. For objective 3 - menu exercise (participants were divided into four groups. Each group was given a menu with a list of items, representing the different seminar elements, and had to put a price on each item. The best possible rating was 20 Polish zlotys and the worst: free of charge. Afterwards the groups presented their menus to each other 4. For objective 4 - round of "last words" from participants and team

RESULTS	<p>Process results: Participants were able to evaluate the seminar in terms of different indicators- the programme contents, the logistics, the training team, how well it responded to their expectations and to what extent the learning objectives were achieved.</p> <p>Content results: In reference to the menu that was completed, some of the main evaluations (see appendix 6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants did not appreciate the educational methods compared to the content • T-kit part remains unclear - especially from the point of view of using it in practice • Missing: energisers, more interactive actions and social activities in the evening • Work in small groups more productive • Summit discussion was evaluated very low • High level of organization • Should be more interactive and flexible. More sharing than ex-cathedra, less protective to context • “For me it was really formal. 3 days of brainstorming is too much I was missing team building, role games etc. participation of the trainers in the evening life was missing” • “Topic not so current in Ukraine, but the actual training elements in this seminar are useful for other contexts (e.g. Amoeba exercise is good in training for leaders)” • Participants thoroughly enjoyed the discussion spaces. Very much an inclusion-oriented group (wanting team to join in discussion) Richness derived from sharing points of view and exploring theme together. • Participants went home with more doubts about the issue. It was difficult for them to grasp the conceptual framework laid out in the T-kit • The general sentiment, shared by participants and team alike was that the seminar had been too short and that the participants would have benefited hugely from one more day in order to put into further practise the theoretical understanding they had acquired and begun to internalise by the last day. • Not much time could be invested in building up the group dynamic and some participants lamented that the seminar was too “result-oriented” during the seminar evaluation. As Laszlo Földi, team member, put it: “after three and half days, the participants had just reached the ‘storming’ stage as a group and obviously felt a sense of loss when the seminar ended exactly at this point”
COMMENTS	See appendix 6 for the overall average prices (results) set for each item on the menu
SUPPORTING MATERIALS USED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flip charts with expectations • Flip charts with objectives • Paper scotch-tape • Printed menus for all participants

CONCLUSIONS /KEY ISSUES FOR REFLECTION

Thus, returning to the learning objectives of the seminar, after having tried to achieve them in a diverse series of sessions, what conclusions can be drawn?

- Engage with different understandings of European Citizenship and frameworks for European citizenship;
- Relate these understandings and frameworks to current and planned youth work practice;
- Understand the nature of T-Kit as an educational resource and consider how it can be used in youth work practice;
- To examine the relationship between youth work and participatory citizenship and the political contexts in which these practices take place;
- Work with the group understanding of (European) citizenship as a personal and political practice.

We can address this question from three different perspectives

- 1. From an educational perspective: what were the learners' conclusions?**
- 2. From an institutional & practical perspective: Tips on how to use T-kit**
- 3. How to train in the use of T-kits**

1. From an educational perspective: what were the learners' conclusions?

We can begin with the premise that the participants took part in this seminar because the above learning objectives addressed in some way their questions and needs as European citizens and European youth workers. Although plural and varied, the motivation behind engaging with these learning objectives boils down to the pursuit of two main goals: Firstly, how to find a working definition of European Citizenship for themselves as “European citizens” and secondly, how to work with young people on the theme of European Citizenship based on their elaborated working definition as “European youth workers”. However, the feedback that began to emerge as the seminar unfolded, and which was confirmed during the final evaluation session (see session outline 12), reflected their crystallising realisation of just how complex and layered the theme of European Citizenship is and just how difficult it is to draw up an individual definition of European Citizenship, let alone a group consensual agreement thereof. In this manner, as participants discussed and examined and engaged with different understandings and the contradictions inherent thereto, the notion of European Citizenship as being “under construction” became more clear-cut. There were no text-book answers to the questions they had come with to the seminar, but as one participant mentioned, “I have more questions and doubts now than I had at the beginning, but I see how they have evolved and become more ‘fine-tuned’”.

However the participants did agree on some basic conclusions about European citizenship. Firstly, in relation to the definition of citizenship as being membership of a political community which involves a set of relationships between rights, duties, participation and identity, they concluded that, in order to be able to work with young people using an European Citizenship framework, it is necessary to have a clear definition of that political community. It is necessary to anchor it in institutions and other concrete references, in order to advocate its legitimacy as a concept in Europe. This, of course, poses somewhat of a dilemma, in the sense that another conclusion shared by the participants was the recognition that they defined their own European citizenship in terms of their values and more on a social and participative level, rather than in political terms. A clear debate emerged around reconciling a philosophical idea of European Citizenship (what values it should represent) with the institutional and political idea of European Citizenship that is currently being promoted through the political projects of the EU and the Council of Europe.

No consensus was reached needless to say, and the debate turned towards the highly topical question of whether European citizenship is simply tantamount to EU citizenship as a legal status and a series of benefits and is otherwise bereft of other identifying characteristics, i.e. “European” values such as respect, human rights and democracy. In addressing this dilemma, the participants were caught between their enthusiasm and zeal at having the opportunity to contribute to the construction of European Citizenship on the one hand and, on the other hand, a wariness of the challenge and potential danger involved in working with young people using a European Citizenship framework that is not “framed” enough. As one participant from Romania summed it up well:

“It is like showing a child an interesting toy but not knowing how it works. If you do not frame it a little more, it is like playing a game, without knowing the rules. (We don’t know where it begins and ends. You breathe it but you do not know what you inhale)”

It was obvious from the feedback that the participants were seeking a hands-on approach to solving this dilemma. Their uncertainty of how to work with young people on this theme, led them on a search for some kind of guidance and reference. Therefore, in their expectations and pre-course questionnaires (the ones the training team actually received), a repeated desire for new methodologies and approaches to European Citizenship was reflected. Although it was stressed in the seminar application form that T-kit 7 is not a manual but rather the basis for a more discursive approach to European Citizenship, it was clear that many of the participants still hoped for some kind of manual. One key conclusion reached by the participants was that, as youth workers, they realised or identified for themselves (again) that in order to motivate the young people they work with on this issue, the challenge lies in finding mechanisms that transmit to young people in what ways and to what extent European citizenship is relevant to their lives. This conclusion was reached based on the widespread perception that young people do not get involved in the European Citizenship process because they do not see the link between this and their needs.

2. From an institutional & practical perspective: Tips on how to use the T-kit

With regard to the one theoretical and practical session on how to use the T-kit and the debriefing session of the practical exercise that was set, the blatantly obvious conclusion drawn was that the participants must actually familiarise themselves with the contents of the T-kit beforehand in order to be capable of extracting any real value from the tips on how to use it, given the limited time available during the seminar dedicated to the T-kit.

Despite explicit instructions in the call for participants to read the T-kit prior to coming to the seminar, the majority of the participants had failed to do so, which seriously dampened the potentiality of the practical session on how to use the T-kit and hindered the cognitive process of understanding the conceptual framework of European Citizenship.

With regard to designing the training approach for any future seminars or training activities that may take place on this theme, it would be recommendable that the training team do some pre-course work to ensure that the selected participants do the required previous reading.

Thus from the offset, the majority of the participants were not clued into the potentiality of the educational resources in the T-kit that could be used to work directly with young people, i.e. the “under construction” symbol that assigns small practical activities (e.g. see pp. 12,13,18,20, 34, 41, etc.), the textboxes with questions for further discussion/reflection (on almost every page), the “European Citizenship Education Matrix” (see pp. 64-65) and the examples of citizenship projects (citizenship scenarios- see pp. 67-89).

With regard to the small practical activities and the questions for further discussion/reflection, one participant noted their usefulness as starting points for beginner trainers. Another participant had used these flagged resources in a classroom with 8 graders to have an open discussion on the theme. Yet another participant added that the “under construction” activities offer the chance to work on specific aspects of the topic that are also suitable for isolated sessions or transferable to a multi-themed programme, without having to try to comprehensively explore each aspect of the theme when faced with the impossibility of organising a whole workshop or event around European Citizenship. Another participant opined that the T-kit provided a variety of frameworks for youth workers, which allows them to structure their knowledge and funnel it into a workable scheme, providing criteria and categories. Furthermore, applying these frameworks allows youth workers to touch on other dimensions, such as intercultural learning, integration, values, etc.

The practical exercise that was set during the session on how to use T-kit 7 involved the European Citizenship Education Matrix on pages 64-65. In small working groups, each participant had to adapt their current youth work projects to the matrix. During the debriefing of this session, participants acknowledged the value of this resource as a usable framework for approaching European Citizenship. Given its complexity,

however, the participants would have needed more time to complete this analytical task in more depth.

In summary of the general evaluation of T-kit 7 as an educational response to the complexity of the issues of European Citizenship, it was concluded that the T-kit has great value of a consultative nature, an educational resource that youth workers can refer to in order to gain insight into some theoretical aspects contained therein and as a source of inspiration for ideas for youth initiatives within a European Citizenship framework, e.g. in particular in referral to the citizenship scenarios, as each example chosen gives a picture of holistic approaches to European Citizenship education and could be cited as examples of “good practices”.

5. How to train in the use of T-kits

As mentioned already in part 2 of the conclusions above, one of the biggest challenges for those working with youth in a European dimension is making a bridge between the apparently abstract notion of European Citizenship and its relevance to the everyday realities of young people. Thus, with regard to T-kit 7: Under Construction - Citizenship, Youth and Europe as an educational resource that addresses this challenge, training young people in the use thereof could very plausibly help lay the cornerstones of the bridge between concept and reality. However the key question to be posed is what factors the training team should bear in mind when training in the use of the T-kit 7.

Furthermore, in light of the fact that this T-kit seminar was a pilot project and thus an experiment, we should also look to the conclusions drawn from the results of this experiment that could be of benefit when designing further seminars or training courses on other T-kits in the series.

Before attempting to outline these factors and conclusions, first a remark regarding the nature of T-kit 7 is warranted. It is curious that this particular T-kit was chosen as the “guinea-pig”, due to the fact that its layout and content are quite different from the other 9 T-kits. Therefore, given the special nature of this particular T-kit, in as far as it is more a guide to the theme of European Citizenship and not a “toolkit” or a manual, as already stated in several parts of this documentation, the conclusions of this seminar may provide insights on how to train in the use of T-kit 7 but these insights may be specific to the special nature of T-kit 7 and not be transferable to the other T-kits in the series. However, there may be some general conclusions to be extrapolated that could apply to other T-kit training events.

It is difficult to draw representative conclusions from just one practical session that was run during the seminar on how to use the T-kit. If we can draw from this experience, however, it can be concluded that, effectively, training in the use of this T-kit is not an easy task. While participants responded positively to the practical session on how to use T-kit 7 (see session outline no. 9 and part 2 of conclusions above), during the debriefing session one participant commented how he saw the value of the T-kit as a preparatory resource for him as a youth worker and trainer.

However, he failed to see the direct applicability of the T-kit (contents) to his youth work, as a training tool i.e. he saw the T-kit more as a support or crutch for his own background understanding of the issue of European Citizenship, but he would have to design the training activities on European Citizenship for his target group himself, albeit armed with the “new” understanding of the issue gained by reading the T-kit.

Two key factors to address when considering how to train in the use of T-kits would be firstly the challenge faced in giving a short seminar that obviously requires training elements and secondly the obstacle of time. More time should be allocated to allow for internalisation of the concepts in the T-kit and more time should be allocated to practical exercises. Moreover, it was noted that the element of networking was very important to the participants and thus they used the resource table introduced by the training team to exhibit leaflets and publications from their own organisations. Some participants also organised a couple of informal meetings outside of the seminar sessions in order to exchange experiences and ideas among themselves. While it is always commendable to see participants take the initiative and self-organise activities within the scope of a seminar, perhaps it is recommendable to also offer an official space for the exchange of best practices, in order to involve the training team and all the participants. However, in order to ensure an authentic arena for the exchange of good practices, it would be necessary to try to use the selection process to choose participants with varying degrees of experience with the T-kit in question.

In the light of the debate on whether European citizenship refers solely to EU citizenship in tangible terms, perhaps it is relevant pointing out the fact that the majority of the 93 applicants for this seminar came from non-EU member states. Can we use this fact as some kind of indicator with regard to youth participation in EU member states and non-EU member states? If it does not indicate anything directly about youth participation, it at least opens up another debate regarding the different motivations behind the participation of youth in this theme. Some participants from non-EU member states expressed their interest in the theme as closely linked to their aspirations of becoming EU members. Having an idea as to why a young person is attracted to a theme would grant the training team a valuable insight on how to focus and approach an activity that aims to train in the use of the specific T-kit related to that theme.

Appendices

[Appendix 1: List of participants and their organisations](#)

[Appendix 2: List of training team and support staff](#)

[Appendix 3: Final programme, as executed](#)

[Appendix 4: Pre-course questionnaire](#)

[Appendix 5: Summarised outcome of Polish Parliament discussion](#)

[Appendix 6: Evaluation: menu and average prices](#)

[Appendix 7: List of references](#)

[Appendix 8: Team evaluation of seminar](#)

Appendix 1: List of participants and their organisations.

Family name and first name:	Country:	Organisation:	Email address:
BICAKU DASHAMIR	ALBANIA	BEYOND THE BARRIERS	dbicaku@yahoo.com , dashamir@gmail.com
CAPULA TERESA	ITALY	COOPERATIVA STUDIO E PROGETTO 2	tcapula@tiscali.it
CHILACHAVA MEDEA	GEORGIA	Youth Association Droni (YAD)	mchilachava@yahoo.com
FRONGIA GIANLUCA	ITALY	TDM 2000	sirluca@tdm2000.org
GRESER JAROSŁAW	POLAND	Fundacja Innowacyjnych Przedsięwzięć Społecznych	jarekgr@tlen.pl
HENDERSON CAROLINE	UK	Scottish Youth Parliament / Youth Planet	carolinehenderson321@hotmail.com
HULKKO ARISTON	FINLAND	Sillalla Human Rights NGO	ariston@sillalla.info
JARCZYK WANDA	POLAND	ZESPOL SZKOL W LIBIAZU	wjarczyk@tlen.pl
LOCHMAN ONDREJ	CZECH REP	LOS-Liberecká občanská společnost	ondrejlochman@webtvor.com
LUNGU DORIAN	ROMANIA	Youth Association for Education, Leadership, Information and Ecology Romania (Atelier)	atelier2200@yahoo.com
MATCOV CATERINA	UK	JEF-Europe/ Young Federal Union UK	ecaterina.matcov@yfu.org.uk
MEYER MORITZ	GERMANY	International Youth Meeting Dachau e.V.	meyer.moritz@o2online.de
ORLOVSKAYA KSENIYA	UKRAINE	ECYC, Ukrainian NGO "Face to Face"	kavs@farlep.net ; kavs@eurocom.od.ua
PACZYNSKA AGNIESZKA	POLAND	St. Maximilian Kolbe House for Meetings and Reconciliation	
PAVLOVIC FILIP	SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO	Fractal NGO	filip93@yahoo.com

SALGADO SILVA CANDIDA	POLAND	Miejska Biblioteka Publiczna- Planeta 11	boninas5@hotmail.com
SCHMIDT-ROST CHRISTIAN	GERMANY	Verein zur Förderung politischen Handelns e.V. (v.f.h.)	ch.schmidt-rost@gmx.de
SHUALI TAMAR	SPAIN	Valencia Regional Parliament- DG Active citizenship	t.shuali@telefonica.net
SIMONYAN LILIT	ARMENIA	“Stepanavan Youth Center” NGO (SYC)	lilit_simonyan@yahoo.com

Appendix 2: List of training team and support staff

Yael Ohana	Educational Advisor of the Directorate of Youth and Sport, Council of Europe	Directorate of Youth and Sport Council of Europe, European Youth Centre, Strasbourg	yael.OHANA@coe.int
Laszlo Földi	Educational Advisor of the Partnership Programme on Youth Worker Training	Partnership Programme on Training Council of Europe and European Commission, Strasbourg	laszlo.FOLDI@coe.int
Gavan Titley	External Trainer	Renvall Institute for Area and Cultural Studies, University of Helsinki, Helsinki	titley@mappi.helsinki.fi
Rouzanna Ivanyan	External trainer	Youth Information Centre, St. Petersburg	rouzanna@youthcentre.ru
Marta Medlinska	Logistics staff	Polish National Agency of the Youth Programme	mmedlinska@youth.org.pl
Piotr Gałazka	Logistics staff	Polish National Agency of the Youth Programme	pgalazka@youth.org.pl
Leigh Brady	Documentalist	ARCI, Catania, Italy	lee.brady@email.it

Appendix 4: Session 12. May 14th 2005. 14.30-17.30

Summarised outcome of the concluding discussion in the framework of the youth summit at the Polish Parliament.

Theme/focus:

Discussion on the relevance of EC for young people and youth work

Concrete questions:

Round 1: What meaning does EC have for me and the young people I work?

Table 1: EC for us means being active citizens, taking responsibility for our environment and society. European identity is not a substitute for national identity but adds an enriching dimension. EC encompasses the promotion of peace worldwide. The opportunities offered by increased mobility and the ability to meet new cultures are crucial for youth.

Table 2: EC is not a grassroots idea, but is somehow imposed from the top down. It has an elite element to it; it does not “belong” to the people. In new accession countries, EC is much associated with EU citizenship, so it somehow discriminates against non-EU members. It is difficult to transfer the idea of EC to a wider European public.

Table 3: EC means sharing values and belonging to a European society.

Table 4: Now after our seminar, we are more confused about the concept of EC, but we agree that it is about participation and involvement.

Table 5: EC mean rights and responsibilities within the community and being able to appreciate your own culture and others.

Table 6: European citizens live in a clear territory with borders, but those borders need not be EU borders. We felt European even before Poland joined the EU. Citizens should collaborate because they live in the same space.

Table 7: Citizenship as a concept should be discussed and debated before focusing on EC. For us, citizenship has to do with participation, voting rights, mobility and solidarity in order to achieve and enhance citizenship.

Table 8: As an Australian, I offer an external view of European citizenship. We see EC in terms of the European Union, which is a model of democracy and tolerance for the rest of the world, whose members enjoy a high standard of living. The EU promotes sharing and preserving cultures and EU members have more civil liberties after joining the Union.

Table 9: EC is based on rights. The right to work both in your native country and in another European country and the right to mobility (There should not be any visas or immigration officers)

Round 2: What visions of Europe are important to European citizenship as we would like to see it develop?

Table 1: We would like to see improved future job perspectives through improved rules and regulations of the job market. Our vision includes a better flow of information through information standards and increased access to positions of public affairs.

Table 2: Our motto is: A Europe of active citizens, a Europe for a better future. Our vision is a Europe without borders, in relation to residence, study, work and leisure. Europe as a continent with equal opportunities for all and with a certain economic stability.

Table 3: European countries should keep their autonomy but at the same time local regions should have more say in decision making on a European level. We call for a change of approach from top-down to bottom-up.

Table 4: Our vision of Europe has tolerance and interculturality as its central axis. It encapsulates much more than just the 25 EU member states. This should be reflected in a reformed immigration policy. The promotion of mobility is also central to our idea of how EC should develop.

Table 5: Our vision of Europe is one of solidarity not only among existing members but also between members and newcomers. Human rights, tolerance, stability and equal opportunities should be at the centre of EC. We envision a better immigration policy

Table 6: Our vision of Europe is one that could represent all those who strive for a more humane society throughout Europe. It should offer the possibility to dream of a common good and pursue it. It must offer its citizens some goals and motivations in order to motivate and get them involved

Table 7: Our Europe would be resourceful and peaceful; it would offer equal standards of living, equal opportunities. Europe would be made up of independent countries that actively cooperate with each other. We promote a council of representatives instead of a president.

Table 8: Our vision of Europe is one that develops economically and politically at the same speed. One Europe with a diversity of cultures.

Round 3: What relationships can we develop between our understandings of European Citizenship and global citizenship?

Table 1: First we must define global citizenship and this is impossible. All we can say is that the needs are the same. Human rights act as a bridge. It is difficult because in Europe there is much emphasis on individual liberty and how can we reconcile that with the global focus of collective responsibility?

Table 2: We see a systematic relationship: EC represents a small framework or system, while global citizenship represents a larger system which we should lean on for global issues like poverty reduction.

Table 3: Common values that join both citizenships are peace and inclusion. There should be a harmonization of policies and attitudes - no double agenda, the same rules and values should apply inside and outside our European territory. All countries are interdependent so we must take responsibility in a global system, not only on a local, regional and European level.

Table 4: Whether as a European or a global citizen, some values are shared- the free market, free trade, human rights. However these ideas are very abstract

Table 5: Instead of global citizenship, we should talk about global “awareness”. As Europeans, we must be prepared to speak about global issues.

Table 6: There is a relationship but global citizenship has more to do with responsibilities than rights. Global citizenship involves a basic connection with nature and basic human needs. Environment, participation problems, etc. As youth workers, we must run activities that will bring our youth in touch with their local problems and show them that it can be extrapolated to the whole world. i.e. if they don't act locally, they are damaging the world on a global level.

Table 7: We can develop the concept of global citizenship based on the value of solidarity. Global values instead of European values? Are there any global values that are not also European values? They are all shared.

Table 8: If EC is feeling ownership in a common project called Europe, then global citizenship is feeling ownership in a common world project. Relationship: Human rights education. The fact that we are interdependent is often abstract so we must find mechanisms to show people that in their everyday lives.

Round 4: How can European Citizenship become a beneficial framework for the work we do with young people?

Table 1: A lot of young people do not want to participate because they fear that their national identities are threatened. Our challenge is to show them the benefits of participating in EC, through capacity-building initiatives, which gives them wider perspectives and choices. (Difficult to speak about the same benefits for Eastern and Western young people)

Table 2: Hard to answer the question, we only agreed that we should promote non-formal education and that there should be equal access to information. (There is a fault in the way the question is formulated. EC is so abstract that it cannot be a framework, it is not stable enough; the coordinates are not identifiable.)

Table 3: Through mobility, participation and opportunities for youth. Youth must have a clearer role in Europe as an actor in decision-making processes. Minorities must have equal opportunities and be involved in building the concept of EC from the start.

Table 4: If youth in their formative years have a positive first experience with international teamwork, this will hopefully have a snowball effect. In order to provide a beneficial framework, it is up to each individual youth worker to make a definition of EC for themselves. For youth, it starts with practical experiential learning.

Table 5: If EC remains an abstract framework, it is not possible to extract benefits therefrom. There must be a connection between politicians and young people. Youth need some real opportunities for political participation)

Table 6: A better, more liberal mobility policy that really offers intercultural opportunities as part of a vision of an inclusive society. Funds and policies to help us enhance the multicultural approach. Better funding of “global education” activities. Political participation for youth

Table 7: Sharing financial resources. Breaking cultural and social barriers. Cooperation between European countries to provide better opportunities. Standard of high values

Table 8: Harmonisation of national youth plans regarding EC. Improve networks on a local level. Create a component under action 1 (of the Youth Programme) to especially practice EC. Educational framework to promote EC in the field of formal education.

APPENDIX 5: MENU EVALUATION: OVERALL AVERAGE PRICES

Content of the seminar	17,4
Methods used during the seminar	14,3
Introduction to the seminar	15,2
Collecting expectations in groups	18
work with newspapers on citizenship issues	15,8
Identity molecule exercise (Gavan)	18,7
Citizenship statements exercise (Yael)	15,2
Group work with newspapers to identify rights, duties, participation and privileges	13,6
Input on Citizenship (Gavan)	15,3
Constructing European citizenship (puzzle exercise)	17,8
Working in groups on developing puzzles and presentation of the results	16,2
Input on T-kit (Yael)	13,5
Using T-kit in practice (group work on projects)	13,9
individual work and preparation for the Summit discussion	13,9
Summit discussion	12,8
Group of participants you were working with	18,2
Trainer's team coordination	16,6
Clarity of presentations and instructions	14,5
T-kit 7 as a recourse	16,5
Recommendation to organise seminars on other T-kits	18,9
Meals during the seminar	17,7
Accommodation during the seminar	19,2
Training facilities during the seminar	19,3

APPENDIX 3: PRE-COURSE QUESTIONNAIRE



Education and Culture

Youth



MINISTERIO DE EDUCACIÓN
CONSEJO DE EUROPA Y COMISIÓN EUROPEA
TRAINING-YOUTH

Seminar on T-Kit Seven

Under Construction: Citizenship, Youth and Europe

10 - 14 May 2005

Pre-seminar Questionnaire

Dear participant,

This questionnaire is meant to help the team of trainers in the final design and planning of the programme of the seminar as well as in the evaluation of the course. We hope also that it will also be a tool for you to assess your own development in relation to the theme of the seminar. This information will be processed anonymously and will not be used for any other purpose than to improve and evaluate the quality and the impact of the seminar.

Thank you !

1. Participant's name:

PART I: BASIC COMPETENCIES IN RELATION TO THE SEMINAR

2. Have you ever taken part in any of the following programmes?

Please tick (☐) the right boxes.

No	Yes as participant	Yes as trainer/organiser
Training Activities of the European Youth Centres ☐	☐	☐
European Voluntary Service ☐	☐	☐
Other EU Youth Programme training activities ☐	☐	☐

If yes for other, please specify:

3. What particularly attracted you about the seminar description? What is now your motivation to attend the seminar?

4. What is your knowledge of European Citizenship?

No knowledge

Detailed knowledge

1	2	3	4	5	6
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please describe briefly the areas of knowledge where you feel stronger and those that that you would like to improve:

5. How do you see yourself as a youth worker / youth activist?

Beginner

Highly experienced

1	2	3	4	5	6
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please describe briefly the work that you feel most confident with:

6. How skilled are you at project management?

*No skills
experienced*

Highly skilled and

1	2	3	4	5	6
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please describe briefly the skills you have and the ones that you would like to improve:

7. In which way have you personally used European citizenship in your youth work?

- ☐ As a theme. Specify:
- ☐ Ran a project. Specify:
- ☐ As a methodology in other youth projects. List some:
- ☐ Other. Specify:
- ☐ I have not used it at all.

Comments:

8. How able and confident are you to communicate in an international environment (in English as well)?

*Poor communication
communicator*

A successful

1	2	3	4	5	6
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please describe briefly the aspects that you feel to have difficulties with: drop the role of leading the group and listen to others

PART II: YOUR WORK ON EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP

9. Has your organisation carried out an international youth project on this theme before?

☐ YES

☐ NO

Please briefly describe the project (append any information if relevant):

10. How and why has the theme of European Citizenship been important in your work / work of your organisation up to date?

11. What are the difficulties that you have faced when trying to carry out a similar project?

12. What is your commitment to developing a concrete project on this theme after this course?

*Unlikely
committed*

Fully

1	2	3	4	5	6
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PART III: YOUR NEEDS AND DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL AT THIS SEMINAR

13. What competencies (skills / knowledge and attitude change) do you hope to improve during this seminar?

14. What do you expect from the seminar team?

15. What do you expect from the rest of the group?

16. What do you expect from yourself?

17. Your comments about the draft programme you have received:

Appendix 6: List of references (books, web-sites, handouts, articles, pictures used)

The Partnership's website: www.training-youth.net

Institutional instruments related to the issues of European Citizenship (political frameworks)

Council of Europe

1. European Convention on the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (ECHR) <http://conventions.coe.int/>
2. Cultural Convention of the Council of Europe (ECC) <http://conventions.coe.int/>
3. Green Paper on the "Future of Democracy in Europe-Trends, Analyses, Reforms" www.coe.int/T/E/Integrated_Projects/democracy
4. Recommendation from the Committee of Ministers to member states on the promotion of the participation of minority young people (2005- not yet published at the time of writing this report. Contact Yael Ohana for consultation of text)
5. Revised European Charter on the participation of young people in local of regional life
www.coe.int/T/E/Cultural_Cooperation/Youth/TXT_charter_participation.pdf

European Union

6. European Parliament and Council Directive 2004/38/EU on the Right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States amending Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68 and repealing Directives 64/221/EEC, 68/360/EEC, 72/194/EEC, 73/148/EEC, 75/35/EEC, 90/364/EEC, 90/365/EEC and 93/96/EEC.
www.europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/l33152.htm
7. European Union guidelines on human rights dialogues. Economic and Financial Affairs Council of 13 December 2001 (not published in the Official Journal)
<http://www.europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/r10115.htm>
8. European Constitution (Title II: Fundamental Rights and Citizenship of the Union, Title VI: The Democratic Life of the Union)
www.europa.eu.int/constitution/en/ptoc10_en.htm
9. Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union
www.europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/l33501.htm

10. White Paper on Youth Policy
www.europa.eu.int/comm/youth/whitepaper/index_en.html
11. Council Decision of 27 November 2001, establishing a Community Action Programme to combat discrimination (2001-2006)
www.europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/133113.htm
12. Proposal for a Council Framework decision on combating racism and xenophobia [COM(2001) 664 final - Official Journal C 75 E of 26 March 2002]
www.europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/133178.htm
13. Second report from the European Commission of 27 May 1997 on Citizenship of the Union, presented to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions [COM(97) 230 final - not published in the Official Journal]

European Constitution interactive map (map the development of the European Constitution ratification process throughout the member states)
www.europa.eu.int/constitution/ratification_en.htm

Other interesting related papers, publications, resources:

European Year of Citizenship through Education 2005
Learning and Living Democracy -Concept Paper
Ad Hoc Committee of Experts for the European Year of Citizenship through Education (CAHCIT)
(Education for Democratic Citizenship) (Council of Europe) Strasbourg, 4 November 2004