



Funded by
the European Union

Pedagogical Tools – Inclusive Deliberation in Teaching and Education





TITLE

EU-CIEMBLY Pedagogical Tools – Inclusive Deliberation in Teaching and Education

AUTHOR

Clara Isabel Serrano (Instituto de Educação da Universidade de Lisboa, UIDEF)

CONTRIBUTORS

Dulce Lopes (University of Coimbra Institute for Legal Research)

Lucía Muñoz Benito (University of Coimbra Institute for Legal Research)

Carmela Barbera (University of Bergamo)

Amaia Lamikiz Jauregiando (University of the Basque Country, UPV/EHU)

Peter Druyts (KSOM Campus Rozenberg)

PROJECT AND FUNDING

This document was produced within the framework of the EU-CIEMBLY project, funded by the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation program under Grant Agreement number 101132694.

WORK PACKAGE / TASK

WP6 – Task 6.6: Pedagogical Tools

HOW TO CITE

Serrano, C. (2026). EU-CIEMBLY Pedagogical Tools – Inclusive Deliberation in Teaching and Education. EU-CIEMBLY Task 6.6. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23568835

LICENSE

CCBY

DISCLAIMER

This deliverable reflects only the authors' views. The Commission is not responsible for its content or any use that may be made of the information it contains.



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CPD	Continuing Professional Development
JRC	Joint Research Centre
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
RFCDL	Council of Europe Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Task 6.6 delivers the pedagogical operationalisation of the EU Citizens' Assembly prototype developed within the EU-CIEMBLY project. It equips teachers, in both initial and in-service training, to design and facilitate intersectionality-aware deliberative practices in schools and to run school Citizens' Assemblies as classroom operationalisations of the project's core model.

This task rests on three pillars: deliberative democracy, intersectionality as a structuring principle (not a decorative theme), and education for critical European citizenship. It maps to the Council of Europe's RFCDC, the European Commission's LifeComp, and the OECD guidance on deliberative processes, providing this Report with potential for policy uptake.

Task 6.6., encapsulated in this Report, provides three integrated outputs: a modular Teacher Training Course (25h; adaptable to 20 to 30h), designed for national accreditation; a Pedagogical Toolkit structured in three layers (conceptual framework, implementation, adaptation) and a set of ready-to-use Toolkit Annexes (I.1 to I.16) comprising templates, assessment rubrics, the course programme, the course evaluation questionnaire, the National Adaptation Grid, a glossary of key concepts and an ethics and safeguarding pack, together with the deliberative scenarios of Annex II.

The pedagogical toolkit included in this Report was piloted in two Portuguese schools (Agrupamento de Escolas de Pombal for 12th-year history students and Agrupamento de Escolas de Odemira for 9th-year history students) in June 2026. It was considered a pedagogical resource, pertinent, flexible, and adjustable to the Portuguese learning objectives. The purpose of this Report is, however, to provide tools that could be implemented in other schools and in other national educational contexts.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	6
1. Purposes of the Pedagogical Tools	6
2. General architecture of the teacher training course	9
3. General architecture of the Pedagogical Toolkit	10
4. National Adaptations	11
5. Evaluation and ethics	12
II. Teacher Training Course.....	13
1. Overview	13
2. Format and delivery	14
4. Competence framework	16
5. Course structure.....	17
6. Assessment and outputs.....	21
7. Integration with the Pedagogical Toolkit	23
8. Ethics and Data Protection.....	24
III. Pedagogical Toolkit.....	24
1. Overview, goals and structure.....	24
2. Part A: Conceptual Framework (Why)	25
2.1. Deliberative democracy and Citizens' Assemblies	26
2.2. Intersectionality in education	26
2.3 Inclusion and participation	26
2.4. Education for critical European citizenship	26
2.5. Policy anchors	27
3. Part B: Implementation Toolkit (How)	27
3.1 School Citizens' Assembly model (core pedagogical model)	27
3.2 Implementation formats	28
3.2.1. Extended format – 3 sessions (pedagogical ideal)	29
3.2.2. Short format – 2 sessions (default in curricular contexts)	30



3.2.3. Compact format – single session (90–120 min).....	31
3.3. Supporting materials.....	31
3.4. Deliberative scenarios for classroom implementation	34
3.5. Assessment framework	35
4. Part C – Adaptation Framework (how to adapt).....	36
5. Ethics and data protection.....	36
6. Integration with the Teacher Training Course	37
IV. Conclusion	37
References	39
Annex I.1: Student Participation Sheet	41
Annex I.2. Teacher Observation Grid.....	42
Annex I.3: Inclusion Checklist	43
Annex I.4: Recommendation Template	44
Annex I.5: Facilitation Guide	45
Annex I.6: Assessment Framework	46
Annex I.7: School Citizens' Assembly Implementation Plan	50
Annex I.8: Inclusion Strategy	53
Annex I.9: Role Cards	55
Annex I.10: Guide to the Phases of Deliberation	57
Annex I.11: Course Programme and Delivery Modalities	59
Annex I.13: National Adaptation Grid (Module 5).....	66
Annex I.15: Ethics and Safeguarding.....	85
Annex I.16: Structured Debate Guide (Module 1)	89
ANNEX II: Deliberative Scenarios	94



I. Introduction

1. Purposes of the Pedagogical Tools

EU-CIEMBLy designs, evaluates and pilots a prototype of an inclusive EU Citizens' Assembly grounded in intersectionality, equality and deliberative democracy. Its ambition is not merely procedural innovation, but the reconfiguration of deliberative mechanisms to avoid structural and intersectional exclusion.

Within this architecture, Task 6.6 plays a strategic translational role. Rather than a parallel educational add-on, it is conceptualised as the pedagogical operationalisation of the Assembly prototype.

Its purposes are:

- To translate the theoretical and institutional Assembly model into educational practice;
- To equip teachers with conceptual and methodological tools to foster inclusive deliberative participation in schools;
- To provide scalable and adaptable training models across consortium countries;
- To strengthen the European dimension of curricula through intersectionality-aware democratic practice.

Task 6.6 thus bridges theory, institutional design, and civic formation, extending the project's impact beyond the EU level into everyday school life.

It, however, does not stand alone. Its coherence with the wider project rests on a clear input-output relationship with the WPs responsible for the theoretical framework, the Assembly design and the piloting activities.

Source (input)	What Task 6.6 receives	What Task 6.6 returns
Theoretical framework (intersectionality, equality, deliberation)	Conceptual foundations, glossary, normative criteria	Educational reformulation of concepts; classroom-adapted operational definitions
Assembly Design and Piloting	Prototype architecture; deliberation phases; inclusion mechanisms	Micro-transposition into School Citizens' Assembly; implementation reports from schools
Assembly Evaluation	Evaluation indicators and metrics	Field data on inclusive participation in educational settings
Dissemination/ Communication	Communication channels; policy uptake pathways	Toolkit as usable output; teacher-training model replicable beyond the project end

The Citizens' Assembly model shifts from purely representative mechanisms to structured deliberation (Bächtiger, Dryzek, Mansbridge & Warren, 2018; OECD, 2020). In educational contexts, this implies promoting reasoned dialogue, exposure to plural perspectives, and structured argumentation and collective decision-making. The classroom becomes a micro-deliberative arena that can rehearse democratic participation (Biesta, 2011).

In this context, a central innovation of EU-CIEMBLy lies in foregrounding intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989; Collins & Bilge, 2020) in the design of democratic mechanisms, particularly Citizens' Assemblies. In educational terms, this requires: (i) recognising how overlapping identities (gender, socio-economic background, ethnicity, disability, migration status) shape access to voice; (ii) addressing power asymmetries in classroom



interactions; (iii) designing deliberative activities that mitigate structural silencing in the school context.

Following Osler & Starkey (2005) and Biesta (2011), the framework underpinning this Pedagogical Toolkit promotes critical rather than normative, plural rather than homogenising, participatory rather than passive citizenship. At a time when education is more necessary for shaping values, an intersectionally based toolkit applicable to democratic practices and experiences is increasingly relevant.

This toolkit explicitly aligns with the Council of Europe Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture (RFCDC) (Barrett et al., 2018) and the European Commission's LifeComp framework (Sala et al., 2020), providing an institutional anchor that increases the deliverable's potential for policy uptake.

The Toolkit is composed of three integrated outputs: a modular Teacher Training Course (25h; adaptable 20 to 30h), designed for national accreditation; a Pedagogical Toolkit structured in three layers (conceptual framework, implementation, adaptation) and a set of ready-to-use Toolkit Annexes (Annexes I.1 to I.16) comprising templates, assessment rubrics, the course programme, the course evaluation questionnaire, the National Adaptation Grid, a glossary of key concepts and an ethics and safeguarding pack, together with the deliberative scenarios of Annex II.

While these Annexes are instrumental to the activities developed, the Teacher Training Course is fully integrated with the EU-CIEMBLY Pedagogical Toolkit. ensuring that the conceptual foundations, pedagogical resources and implementation tools developed by the project are systematically embedded throughout the training program. Indeed, the purpose of the EU-CIEMBLY Pedagogical Tools - Inclusive Deliberation in Teaching and Education is to ensure that a wide range of educators have easy, comprehensive access to materials and activities that may further embed intersectionality in their teaching, with a focus on participation, democracy, and citizenship.



2. General architecture of the teacher training course

The Teachers' Training Course, better described in Part II of this Report, is based on the following referential guidelines:

- Duration: 25 hours (national adaptation band: 20 to 30h)
- Format: modular; blended, face-to-face or fully online
- Target group: lower and upper secondary education teachers (in-service) and trainee teachers (initial teacher education)
- Certification: adaptable to national accreditation systems
- Approach: experience → reflect → conceptualise → apply (Kolb, 1984)
- Synchronous and asynchronous balance: at least 60% synchronous and at most 40% asynchronous; in the reference 25-hour programme this is operationalised as 16 synchronous hours (64%) and 9 asynchronous hours (36%), as set out in Annex I.11
- Group size: 18 to 24 teachers (admissible band: 12 to 30)
- Assessment and certification: attendance of at least two-thirds of the synchronous hours and submission of three participant outputs – a School Citizens' Assembly Implementation Plan (Annex I.7), an Inclusion Strategy (Annex I.8) and an assessment design based on Annex I.6, Part A – graded A, B or C against the rubric in Annex I.6, Part B

The modules envisaged are as follows:



Module	Title	Hours	Core focus
1	Deliberative Democracy and Citizens' Assemblies	4h	Conceptual foundations; EU-CIEMBLY framework
2	Intersectionality and Participation Inequalities	4h	Structural inequalities; voice asymmetries; distribution of power in the classroom
3	Designing Inclusive Deliberative Spaces	5h	Facilitation strategies; dialogic learning; conflict management
4	School Citizens' Assemblies: Methodology and Practice	7h	Full transposition of the model; simulation; design workshop
5	Implementation and Adaptation in National Contexts	5h	Curriculum alignment; disciplinary integration; pilot planning

3. General architecture of the Pedagogical Toolkit

The Pedagogical Toolkit is the principal public-facing deliverable of Task 6.6, and it aims to provide Teachers and Schools with tools to organise activities such as School Citizens' Assemblies, embedded within the intersectional vein of the EU-CIEMBLY project. It is organised in three layers:

Layer	Question	Content
Part A: Conceptual Framework	Why?	Deliberative democracy; intersectionality in education; inclusion and voice; critical EU citizenship.



Layer	Question	Content
Part B: Implementation Toolkit	How?	School Citizens' Assembly model (extended, short and compact formats); activity guides; inclusion tools; assessment framework; ready-to-use materials (Annexes I.1 to I.16) and deliberative scenarios (Annex II).
Part C: Adaptation Framework	How to adapt?	National curriculum alignment; disciplinary integration; flexible implementation formats; the National Adaptation Grid (Annex I.13).

To accommodate the diversity of school timetables and institutional constraints, the Toolkit allows schools to organise a School Citizens' Assembly in three formats (extended, short, or compact). All formats preserve the same three core deliberative phases – understanding, deliberating and recommending, framed by a preparation stage and a closing debriefing, as set out in Annex I.10. All formats draw on the same core supporting materials: the student participation sheet (Annex I.1), the teacher observation grid (Annex I.2), the inclusion checklist (Annex I.3), the recommendation template (Annex I.4), the general facilitation guide (Annex I.5), the role cards (Annex I.9), the guide to the phases of deliberation (Annex I.10) and the ethics and safeguarding pack (Annex I.15).

4. National Adaptations

The Pedagogical Toolkit included in this Report was piloted at two Portuguese schools (Agrupamento de Escolas de Pombal for 12th-year history students and Agrupamento de Escolas de Odemira for 9th-year history students) in June 2026. It was considered a pertinent, flexible, and adaptable pedagogical resource aligned with Portuguese learning objectives. This report also aims to provide tools that could be implemented in other



schools and national educational contexts, adapted to each national guideline and curriculum.

Adaptation is not left to the teacher's initiative alone. Task 6.6 provides a National Adaptation Grid, included as Annex I.13 and used as the working instrument of Module 5. The grid is organised in three parts. Part A records the national curricular anchoring: the legal basis of the curriculum, the citizenship education component, the national strategy, the mandatory domains most directly mobilised, the national competence framework, space for interdisciplinary work, assessment rules to observe, the accreditation body for continuing professional development, and institutional opportunities and constraints.

Part B establishes the disciplinary alignment between national learning outcomes, RFCDC and LifeComp anchors, possible assembly themes, formats and assessment.

Part C distinguishes the assembly format (Extended, Short, Compact) from the implementation format (single lesson, teaching unit, interdisciplinary project, extracurricular activity).

The Portugal column is completed as a worked example, with accreditation through a CFAE (*Centros de Formação de Associação de Escolas*) or through the *Associação de Professores de História* (APH). National experts completed the columns for Spain, Italy, and Belgium, who can validate the curricular correspondences in their own education systems. This grid could be replicated across other national contexts because it relies on concepts and frameworks common to all educational systems.

5. Evaluation and ethics

The evaluation strategy of the present EU-CIEMBLy Pedagogical Tools - Inclusive Deliberation in Teaching and Education operates at two levels: (i) evaluation of the training action itself, following a Kirkpatrick-inspired four-level model (Kirkpatrick &



Kirkpatrick, 2016); (ii) evaluation of Task 6.6 as a whole, using process, output and outcome indicators. Two instruments are already available. The Course Evaluation Questionnaire (Annex I.12) covers Level 1 (reaction) and, through its self-assessment section, the perceived gains of Level 2 (learning); the participant-output rubric (Annex I.6, Part B) provides the evidence base for Level 2. Levels 3 (transfer to practice) and 4 (impact on students and schools) draw on the pilot implementation in Portuguese schools and on the observation instruments of Annexes I.1 to I.3.

As Task 6.6 involves schools, minors, focus groups and feedback collection, it operates under a dedicated ethics protocol aligned with EU-CIEMBLy's Data Management Plan and Ethics deliverables. This includes: (i) child safeguarding procedures during in-school activities; (ii) written informed consent from parents or guardians and age-appropriate assent from students; (iii) GDPR-compliant handling of records, photographs, audio and video, with data minimisation and defined retention periods; (iv) specific care in the treatment of sensitive or contested topics, so that no student is required to speak from a personal experience of discrimination; (v) an escalation route to the EU-CIEMBLy Ethics Advisory Board for any ethical concern arising during implementation. All templates (consent, assent, information sheets, data processing notices) are provided in Annex I.15 – Ethics and Safeguarding.

II. Teacher Training Course

1. Overview

The Teacher Training Course constitutes the core training deliverable of Task 6.6 and the principal capacity-building instrument of the EU-CIEMBLy project. It is designed as a modular, flexible and adaptable programme to support both initial teacher education and in-service teacher training. The course equips educators with the conceptual understanding and practical tools required to implement inclusive deliberative practices in educational settings, drawing directly on the EU-CIEMBLy Citizens' Assembly model.



It provides a coherent professional development pathway that enables teachers to understand, experience, implement, evaluate and adapt deliberative pedagogies based on a School Citizens' Assembly model.

The course is designed for submission for national accreditation as a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) programme through the relevant teacher training and accreditation bodies in each participating country.

2. Format and delivery

Parameter	Reference value	National adaptation band
Total duration	25 hours	20 to 30 hours
Delivery mode	Blended (recommended)	Face-to-face or fully online acceptable
Synchronous share (blended)	$\geq 60\%$ (15h)	Adjustable to national CPD rules
Asynchronous share (blended)	$\leq 40\%$ (10h)	Reading, reflection tasks, materials review
Group size	18–24 teachers	12–30 admissible
Structure	Five modular, sequential modules	Modular structure adaptable to national contexts; Modules 1–4 core and Module 5 nationally adapted



3. Pedagogical approach and learning objectives

The course is based on an experiential and practice-oriented methodology, structured under the following four-step sequence, applied within each module: experience (participants take part directly in deliberative activities); reflect (participants examine what happened and how it felt from a participant perspective); conceptualise (participants connect the experience to the theoretical framework: deliberative democracy, intersectionality, and inclusion); and apply (participants translate these insights into concrete pedagogical designs for their own educational contexts).

This approach ensures that teachers not only understand deliberative processes conceptually but also develop the ability to facilitate them effectively in their own educational practice.

By the end of the course, participants will be able to:

- Understand the principles of deliberative democracy and Citizens' Assemblies and articulate their educational relevance;
- Recognise and address inequalities in classroom participation using an intersectional lens;
- Design inclusive deliberative learning environments adapted to their subject and school context;
- Implement the School Citizens' Assembly model in their teaching practice;
- Assess student learning and process quality through the EU-CIEMBLY evaluation rubrics;
- Adapt deliberative pedagogies to national curricular frameworks and to different disciplinary contexts (e.g. History, Citizenship Education, Social Sciences, and Languages).



4. Competence framework

Each learning objective is aligned with the Council of Europe Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture (RFCDC) and the European Commission's LifeComp framework developed by the Joint Research Centre (JRC). This alignment ensures that the course is consistent with European competence frameworks, which are increasingly reflected in national curricula and teacher professional development.

Course competence	RFCDC anchor	LifeComp anchor
Deliberative reasoning	Skills: analytical and critical thinking; knowledge and critical understanding of politics, law and democracy	Social: communication
Inclusive facilitation	Values: human dignity and human rights; Attitudes: respect	Social: empathy; Collaboration
Intersectional awareness	Values: valuing cultural diversity; Attitudes: openness to cultural otherness	Learning: critical thinking
Democratic agency in schools	Skills: autonomous learning skills; Skills: co-operation	Personal: agency
Curricular integration	Knowledge and critical understanding of language, communication and the world	Learning: managing learning



5. Course structure

The course is organised into five modules. Modules 1 to 4 constitute the shared European core of the programme, while Module 5 is designed for national adaptation using the National Adaptation Grid.

Each module follows the pedagogical cycle presented in Section 3 (Experience – Reflect – Conceptualise – Apply), although the relative emphasis on each phase varies according to the module’s specific learning objectives.

Module 1 – Deliberative Democracy and Citizens’ Assemblies (4h)

Focus

Conceptual foundations (see Annex I.16)

Contents:

- Deliberative democracy: key principles (inclusion, publicity, reason-giving, respect).
- Citizens’ Assemblies as democratic innovations.
- The EU-CIEMBLy framework and its educational relevance.

Learning activity

Participants engage in a short structured deliberative exercise (“Should students have a greater role in school decision-making?”), followed by guided reflection and connection to the conceptual framework.

Sub-timing

- Input and discussion (1h)
- Deliberative experience (1.5h)
- Debrief and conceptualisation (1h)
- Individual reflection (0.5h)

Objective

Introduce participants to deliberative practices through direct experience.



Module 2 – Intersectionality and Participation Inequalities (4h)

Focus

Structural inequalities in participation.

Contents

- Intersectionality and overlapping systems of inequality.
- Power relations and voice in educational settings.
- Mechanisms of exclusion and silencing.

Learning activity

Analysis of classroom participation patterns using short video vignettes, supported by inclusion tools (participation checklist and observation grid – Annex I.1 and I.2).

Sub-timing

- Input (1h)
- Group case analysis (1.5h)
- Cross-group discussion (1h)
- Application to participants' own teaching context (0.5h)

Objective

Develop awareness of participation asymmetries and equip teachers with strategies to promote more inclusive participation.

Module 3 – Designing Inclusive Deliberative Spaces (5h)

Focus

Pedagogical design and facilitation.

Contents

- Facilitation strategies.
- Structuring deliberative dialogue.
- Conflict management and respectful engagement.
- Classroom organisation and time management.

Learning activity



Simulation of deliberative activities using structured roles and facilitation techniques, followed by peer feedback on facilitation practice.

Sub-timing

- Input on facilitation (1h)
- Role simulation – Round 1 (1.5h)
- Peer feedback (0.5h)
- Role simulation – Round 2 with role rotation (1.5h)
- Consolidation (0.5h)

Objective

Equip teachers with practical tools to create inclusive and dialogic learning environments.

Module 4 – School Citizens’ Assemblies: Methodology and Practice (7h)

Focus

Implementation of the model.

This module constitutes the operational core of the course, translating the EU-CIEMBLY Citizens’ Assembly model and its core principles – deliberation, inclusion, and intersectionality – into classroom practice.

Contents

- Structure of School Citizens’ Assemblies.
- Roles (facilitators, participants, observers).
- Deliberation phases (understanding, deliberation, decision-making).
- Comparison of the Extended (3 sessions), Short (2 sessions), and Compact (1 session) formats.
- Use of pedagogical materials and EU-CIEMBLY toolkit resources.

Sub-timing

- **Block A** – Mini-assembly – Full simulation of a compact-format School Citizens’ Assembly on a substantive topic. Participants assume student roles (3 h)
- **Block B** – Debriefing and critical reflection – Structured reflection on inclusion dynamics, quality of argumentation, deliberative processes and collective decision-making, using the observation grids (1 h)



- **Block C** – Design workshop – Working in small teams, participants design their own School Citizens' Assembly for their teaching context using the templates provided in Annex I (3 h)

Participants use the structured templates, facilitation guides, observation grids and recommendation templates included in the EU-CIEMBLy Toolkit (Annex I) to develop their own assemblies.

Objective

Enable teachers to confidently implement deliberative assemblies in their own school settings.

Module 5 – Implementation and Adaptation in National Contexts (5h)

Focus

Transfer and contextualisation.

This module is intentionally designed for national adaptation. Each partner country uses the National Adaptation Grid (Annex I.13: National Adaptation Grid (Module 5) to identify curricular anchors, disciplinary entry points and appropriate implementation formats within its own education system.

Illustrative examples from Portugal, Spain, Italy and Belgium demonstrate how the same pedagogical model can be aligned with different curricular structures, teacher education traditions and school contexts

Contents

- Alignment with national curricula.
- Adaptation to disciplinary contexts (History, Citizenship Education, Social Sciences, Languages).
- Flexible implementation formats (lesson, teaching unit, project or extracurricular activity).
- Institutional opportunities and constraints.

Learning activity

Participants design a School Citizens' Assembly adapted to their own teaching context, using the completed National Adaptation Grid as a reference.

Sub-timing

- Presentation of the national adaptation grid (1h)



- Curricular mapping exercise (1.5h)
- Individual planning (1.5h)
- Peer review and discussion (1h)

Objective

Ensure the scalability and adaptability of the EU-CIEMBLY model across different educational systems while maintaining a shared European pedagogical framework.

6. Assessment and outputs

The course follows a practice-based assessment approach, centred on designing transferable pedagogical resources that participants can implement in their own educational settings.

Participant outputs are assessed using the rubric below, aligned with the learning objectives, the competence framework, and the EU-CIEMBLY pedagogical toolkit.

Each participant produces three complementary outputs:

- Output 1 – School Citizens’ Assembly implementation plan: a complete implementation plan for a School Citizens’ Assembly adapted to their own teaching context, using one of the three proposed formats (Extended, Short or Compact).
- Output 2 – Inclusion strategy: a strategy explaining how participation asymmetries and barriers to inclusion will be identified and addressed within the participants’ own classroom or educational setting.
- Output 3 – Assessment and evaluation framework: an assessment framework specifying the indicators (Annex I.6), evidence collection methods, and evaluation procedures that will be used to monitor both student learning and the quality of the deliberative process.



Together, these outputs ensure that the training has a direct, practical and transferable impact on participants' professional practice, facilitating the implementation of deliberative pedagogies in diverse educational contexts.

Assessment rubric

Criterion	Excellent (A)	Proficient (B)	Developing (C)
Conceptual integration	Explicit, accurate and coherent application of deliberative democracy and intersectionality throughout the proposed intervention.	Frameworks are correctly referenced but only partially integrated into the design.	Frameworks are mentioned but not meaningfully operationalised.
Inclusion strategy	Specific, evidence-informed measures clearly address identified participation asymmetries in the target group.	Appropriate inclusion measures are proposed but without a systematic diagnosis of the specific context.	Inclusion is addressed only through generic statements, with no clear strategy.
Feasibility and implementation	Realistic planning, appropriate use of resources, institutional feasibility, and anticipation of potential implementation challenges.	The proposal is generally realistic, although implementation challenges are only partially considered.	The proposal lacks sufficient detail or is not feasible within the stated educational context.
Assessment and evaluation design	Indicators are appropriately selected from Annex I.6 and accompanied by clear evidence collection methods and evaluation procedures.	Relevant indicators are identified, but methods for collecting or interpreting evidence remain underdeveloped.	Indicators are absent, insufficiently justified or not linked to a coherent evaluation strategy.



A complete version of the assessment rubric, including detailed performance descriptors for each criterion and achievement level, is provided in Annex I.6 (Assessment Framework).

7. Integration with the Pedagogical Toolkit

The Teacher Training Course is fully integrated with the EU-CIEMBLY Pedagogical Toolkit described in Part III of this Report, ensuring that the conceptual foundations, pedagogical resources and implementation tools developed by the project are systematically embedded throughout the training program.

The different parts of the toolkit support the course as follows:

- Conceptual Framework (Toolkit Part A): supports Modules 1 and 2 by providing the theoretical foundations of deliberative democracy, intersectionality and inclusive participation.
- Implementation Toolkit (Toolkit Part B): supports Modules 3 and 4 through facilitation guides, activity templates, observation grids and practical resources for implementing School Citizens' Assemblies.
- Adaptation Framework (Toolkit Part C): supports Module 5 by providing the National Adaptation Grid and guidance for aligning the model with different curricular and institutional contexts.

The Teacher Training Course therefore functions as the pedagogical activation of the EU-CIEMBLY Pedagogical Toolkit, ensuring that its conceptual principles, methodological resources and practical tools are effectively translated into classroom practice across different educational systems.



8. Ethics and Data Protection

The Teacher Training Course is delivered to adult participants (teachers). It therefore involves only the standard ethical considerations associated with continuing professional development, including informed participation and compliance with data protection requirements.

Since participants will subsequently implement School Citizens' Assemblies with children and young people in school settings, Module 4 includes dedicated guidance on ethics, safeguarding and responsible educational practice (Annex I.15).

III. Pedagogical Toolkit

1. Overview, goals and structure

The Pedagogical Toolkit is a comprehensive, modular and adaptable resource to support teachers in implementing inclusive deliberative practices in educational contexts. It is the pedagogical translation of the EU-CIEMBLY Citizens' Assembly prototype, transforming its core principles – deliberation, inclusiveness, equality, and intersectionality – into structured teaching and learning tools.

The toolkit is intended for use across different educational levels, with primary focus on secondary education (lower and upper); multiple disciplinary contexts (History, Citizenship Education, Social Sciences, Language Education); and diverse national educational systems, via the Adaptation Framework (Part C).

This Pedagogical Toolkit introduces three key innovations: **educational transposition of democratic innovation**, since it translates a political mechanism (Citizens' Assembly) into a pedagogical model, without reducing it to a debate exercise; **Operationalisation of intersectionality**, once it embeds intersectionality in classroom design, facilitation, and evaluation – not as a discourse but as a set of concrete instruments; **Development**



of deliberative competences, given it promotes argumentation, listening, negotiation and collective reasoning as trainable, assessable competences aligned with RFCDC and LifeComp.

The Pedagogical Toolkit aims to:

- Support the development of students' deliberative competences.
- Promote inclusive and equitable participation in classroom settings.
- Provide teachers with practical and ready-to-use pedagogical resources.
- Facilitate the integration of critical European citizenship education.
- Ensure adaptability across national and curricular contexts.

The toolkit is organised into four parts:

Part	Question	Content
Part A	Why?	Conceptual Framework – theoretical and normative foundations.
Part B	How?	Implementation Toolkit – the School Citizens' Assembly model and supporting resources.
Part C	How to adapt?	Adaptation Framework – curricular integration and national tailoring.

2. Part A: Conceptual Framework (Why)

This section provides the theoretical and normative foundations of the toolkit whose function is to provide teachers with a conceptual grounding for the pedagogical practices proposed, in alignment with the framework developed under the EU-CIEMBLY project.



2.1. Deliberative democracy and Citizens' Assemblies

- Principles of deliberative democracy – inclusion, publicity, reason-giving, respect (Bächtiger et al., 2018).
- Citizens' Assemblies as democratic innovations (OECD, 2020).
- Relevance for education – moving from participation as consultation to participation as deliberation.

2.2. Intersectionality in education

- Structural inequalities and overlapping forms of disadvantage (Crenshaw, 1989).
- Participation asymmetries in classroom contexts.
- Intersectionality as a design and facilitation principle, not only an analytical lens (Karatzia & O'Connor, 2025).

2.3 Inclusion and participation

- Unequal distribution of voice in classroom talk.
- Strategies for equitable participation.
- Creation of safe and dialogic learning environments.

2.4. Education for critical European citizenship

- Critical and plural conceptions of citizenship.
- Engagement with complex and contested issues, including memory and history.
- Development of democratic agency, anchored in RFCDC and LifeComp competences.



2.5. Policy anchors

The Toolkit is anchored in two European competence frameworks; a third is mobilised for one scenario only.

- RFCDC (Council of Europe, Barrett et al., 2018) – values, attitudes, skills, knowledge for democratic culture.
- LifeComp (JRC, Sala et al., 2020) – personal, social and learning-to-learn competences.
- GreenComp (JRC, Bianchi et al., 2022) – mobilised only for the Climate Action deliberative scenario; it is not part of the general competence anchoring of the training course.

3. Part B: Implementation Toolkit (How)

This part is the operational core of the toolkit, offering concrete tools for classroom practice.

3.1 School Citizens' Assembly model (core pedagogical model)

a) Overview

This model constitutes the core pedagogical translation of the EU-CIEMBLy Citizens' Assembly prototype. It adapts the principles of inclusive deliberation, intersectionality and collective decision-making to school contexts, enabling students to engage as active democratic participants.

b) Core elements.

- Clearly defined objectives, framed as a substantive question.
- Defined roles (facilitator, participants, observers).



- Principles of deliberation: equality of voice, respectful dialogue, evidence-based argumentation, collective decision-making.
- Target group: secondary education students (adaptable).
- Overall objective: to develop inclusive deliberative competences.

3.2 Implementation formats

The School Citizens' Assembly model can be implemented in three formats, depending on time availability and institutional constraints:

Format	Sessions	Total duration	Best for
Extended	3 sessions × 60–90 min	3–4.5 hours	Deeper engagement, in-course integration
Short	2 sessions × 60–90 min	2–3 hours	Standard curricular integration in one or two lessons
Compact	1 session × 90–120 min	1.5–2 hours	Pilots, workshops, extracurricular slots

Design principle. Regardless of format, all three preserve the same phase logic – the three core phases of understanding, deliberation and decision, framed by a preparation stage and a closing debriefing (Annex I.10) – and the same inclusion principles. The Extended format is the pedagogical ideal for full implementation; the Short format is the default option in most curricular contexts; the Compact format is the recommended entry point for pilot activities and for classes with no prior experience of deliberation.



3.2.1. Extended format – 3 sessions (pedagogical ideal)

Session 1 – Understanding the issue and building the group

Objectives

Introduce the topic; establish a safe deliberative environment; ensure basic understanding of the issue.

Steps

- 1) Icebreaker (“Where do I stand?”)
- 2) Contextualisation with contrasting perspectives
- 3) Small group discussion
- 4) Plenary sharing – 5) Individual reflection.

Session 2 – Deliberation

Objectives

Develop argumentation skills; ensure inclusive participation; confront diverse perspectives.

Steps

- 1) Role assignment
- 2) Structured deliberation
- 3) Inclusion check (reflection on participation patterns and power dynamics)
- 4) Re-deliberation
- 5) Drafting recommendations.

Session 3 – Decision and reflection

Objectives

Produce collective recommendations; consolidate learning; evaluate the deliberative process.

Steps

- 1) Final deliberation
- 2) Assembly plenary



- 3) Voting (simple or consensus-based)
- 4) Collective reflection
- 5) Written reflection.

3.2.2. Short format – 2 sessions (default in curricular contexts)

Session 1 – Understanding and deliberation (60–90 min)

Objectives

The default option in most curricular contexts, for teachers who can allocate two consecutive lessons but not three. It reserves the phase logic by merging the Session 1 and Session 2 activities of the Extended format, ensures understanding of the issue and the conduction of the core deliberation cycle.

Steps

- 1) Icebreaker (“Where do I stand?”) – 10 min
- 2) Contextualisation with contrasting sources – 15 min
- 3) Role assignment and structured small-group deliberation – 25 min
- 4) Inclusion check and re-deliberation – 15 min
- 5) Draft positions – 5 min.

Session 2 – Decision and reflection (60–90 min)

Objectives

Reach a collective decision; reflect on the process; evaluate participation.

Steps

- 1) Presentation of positions – 15 min
- 2) Cross-group deliberation and refinement – 25 min
- 3) Drafting recommendations – 15 min
- 4) Voting or consensus-building – 10 min
- 5) Collective and written reflection – 15 min



3.2.3. Compact format – single session (90–120 min)

Single session

Objectives

Condenses the full deliberative process into one session while preserving inclusive participation, structured deliberation and collective decision-making. Particularly suited for pilot implementations, workshops, and extracurricular or project-based activities.

Steps

- 1) Understanding the issue, including an icebreaker (“Where do I stand?”) 2, a short contextualisation (teacher input with 2–3 contrasting sources) and a brief small-group exchange (20-25 min)
- 2) Deliberating, including role assignment (stakeholders), structured deliberation in small groups, inclusion check (short reflective pause) and a re-deliberation and refinement of positions (40-50 min)
3. Recommending and Reflecting, including drafting recommendations, plenary sharing, voting or consensus-building and a short collective reflection (25-30 min).

The phases, their purposes, indicative timings and facilitation focus are set out in Annex I.10 – Guide to the Phases of Deliberation. A fully scripted session of 90 to 120 minutes, usable as a model for the Compact format, is provided in Annex I.16 – Structured Debate Guide (Module 1).

3.3. Supporting materials

The following materials are provided as templates in Annex I and they consist of several add-ons to the Pedagogical Toolkit that help guide, structure and materialise its several steps. Some of its components (for instance Annex I.6 and I.7) are also instrumental to the Teachers Training Course.

- Student participation sheet (Annex I.1), a short self-report form completed by each student at the end of the assembly, capturing their own engagement, listening and reflection.



- Teacher observation grid (Annex I.2), a four-criterion rubric (balanced participation, quality of arguments, respect, inclusion of diverse voices) used by the teacher to record process quality during the assembly.
- Inclusion checklist (Annex I.3), a brief checklist that helps the facilitator verify, in real time, whether all voices had space to speak and whether the environment remained respectful.
- Recommendation template with worked example (Annex I.4), a structured template (theme, problem, proposal, justification, expected impact) that students use to formalise the recommendation produced by the assembly, with a worked example provided.
- General facilitation guide (Annex I.5), a concise before/during/after guide for the teacher-facilitator, covering ground rules, balanced speaking time and post-session reflection.
- Assessment framework (Annex I.6): a two-part instrument: Part A is used by the teacher to assess student learning and process quality in the assembly; Part B is the rubric used by the trainer to grade the three participant outputs in the Teacher Training Course.
- School Citizens' Assembly Implementation Plan (Annex I.7), the planning template teachers used to design their own assembly (theme, curricular framing, format, roles, expected outputs, ethics); it is also Output 1 of the Teacher Training Course.
- Inclusion Strategy (Annex I.8), the template through which teachers diagnose participation asymmetries in their group, identify relevant intersectional dimensions and plan concrete facilitation measures; it is Output 2 of the Teacher Training Course.



- Role cards for the assembly (Annex I.9), six printable cards (Facilitator, Participant, Observer, Rapporteur, Timekeeper, Expert) that assign and clarify assembly roles, designed to be rotated across sessions.
- Guide to the phases of deliberation, with indicative timings (Annex I.10), a step-by-step operationalisation of the three deliberative phases (understanding, deliberation, decision), with indicative timings for the Compact, Short and Extended formats.
- Course programme and delivery modalities (Annex I.11), the full session-by-session programme of the 25-hour Teacher Training Course for the three delivery modes (blended, face-to-face and fully online).
- Course evaluation questionnaire for participants (Annex I.12), the end-of-course questionnaire completed by participants, covering Kirkpatrick Level 1 (reaction) and, through self-assessment, the perceived gains of Level 2 (learning).
- National Adaptation Grid for Module 5 (Annex I.13), the working instrument of Module 5, mapping national curricular anchors, disciplinary alignments and admissible assembly and implementation formats; a completed example is provided for Portugal.
- Glossary of key concepts (Annex I.14), a short reference glossary of the core vocabulary of the toolkit (deliberation, intersectionality, facilitation, inclusion, and related terms).
- Ethics and safeguarding, including informed consent (parent/guardian) and assent (student) templates (Annex I.15), the ethics pack, including parental/guardian informed consent and student assent templates, GDPR-compliant data handling notes, safeguarding procedures and a protocol for sensitive topics.



- Structured debate guide for Module 1 (Annex I.16), the guided activity used in Module 1 to introduce deliberative practice to teachers, with briefing cards, timings and materials specified.

A central innovation of the toolkit is that it includes participation checklists (Annex I.3), strategies for inclusive facilitation (Annex I.5), techniques for engaging quieter participants, planned in advance through the Inclusion Strategy (Annex I.8) and conflict management guidelines (Annex I.5; Module 3 of the training course). These tools operationalise intersectionality in practice, ensuring equitable participation.

3.4. Deliberative scenarios for classroom implementation

The model is complemented by the thematic assemblies in Annex II, designed to enable teachers to apply it across diverse curricular and societal issues while maintaining coherence and contextual flexibility. Three scenarios are fully specified in the current version of the Annexes:

- **Assembly 1 – Climate Action** (cross-referenced with GreenComp).
- **Assembly 2 – Artificial Intelligence** (digital citizenship and AI regulation).
- **Assembly 3 – Social Inequality** (redistribution and social justice).

Other scenarios could be foreseen and applied, according to each curriculum, for instance an Assembly on Memory and Contested History (historical perspectives, particularly relevant for History and Citizenship classes; anchored in the *Associação de Professores de História* (APH)-led work) and an Assembly on Migration and European Citizenship (belonging, mobility, and the boundaries of citizenship). Teachers wishing to work on contested memory may use the worked example provided in Annex I.13, Part B.

Ready-to-use activities can also be inserted into any of the three formats:



- Structured debates – fully specified in Annex I.16, including the distinction between deliberation and debate.
- Role-play simulations (e.g. EU policy negotiation).
- Multiperspectivity analysis (particularly suited to History).
- Policy recommendation workshops.

3.5. Assessment framework

The Assessment framework provides tools to assess both process and outcomes, with an emphasis on process-oriented and reflective assessment. The full framework is in Annex I.6:

- Assessment of student learning (Annex I.6, Part A): preparation and use of evidence; clarity and relevance of arguments; active listening; engagement with opposing views; contribution to shared decisions; respect for the ground rules; critical self-reflection.
- Inclusion indicators: distribution of participation and diversity of perspectives, recorded through the teacher observation grid (Annex I.2) and the inclusion checklist (Annex I.3).
- Student self-assessment, integrated into the student participation sheet (Annex I.1) and into the self-reflection section of Annex I.6, Part A.
- Assessment of participant outputs in the training course (Annex I.6, Part B): conceptual integration; inclusion strategy; feasibility and implementation; assessment and evaluation design – each graded A, B or C.



4. Part C – Adaptation Framework (how to adapt)

This section ensures the toolkit's transferability across contexts. It is operationalised through the National Adaptation Grid, which is included in Annex I.13 and serves as the working instrument for Module 5 of the training course. The columns for Portugal, Spain, Italy, and Belgium are complete to illustrate how other adaptations could be inserted into the Grid.

Alignment with national curricula

The toolkit is designed to integrate into existing curricular frameworks. Examples of disciplinary hosts include History, Citizenship Education, Social Sciences, and Language Education.

Teachers are encouraged to select relevant local or national issues, adapt duration and format (Extended/Short/Compact) and integrate curriculum-specific goals and learning outcomes.

5. Ethics and data protection

The Toolkit is used with minors in school settings. All implementations must comply with respect for the following minimum standards (operational templates in Annex I.15):

- **Informed consent.** Written consent from parents/guardians and age-appropriate assent from students, using the templates in Annex I.15.
- **Data protection.** GDPR-compliant handling of any records, photographs, audio or video. Personal data is not to be shared outside the pedagogical use case without explicit consent.
- **Safeguarding.** Attention to vulnerable participants and the management of sensitive topics, particularly when an assembly addresses contested memory,



discrimination, or migration. No student may be required to speak from a personal experience of discrimination.

- **Ethics Advisory Board.** The EU-CIEMBLY consortium Ethics Advisory Board serves as an escalation route for any ethical concern arising during implementation.

6. Integration with the Teacher Training Course

The toolkit and the training course are fully interconnected. The training course develops teachers' competences; the toolkit provides the resources for implementation. Modules 1 and 2 of the course draw on Part A of this toolkit, Modules 3 and 4 on Part B and Module 5 on Part C. The three outputs that participants produce in order to be certified are themselves toolkit instruments: the School Citizens' Assembly Implementation Plan (Annex I.7), the Inclusion Strategy (Annex I.8) and an assessment design based on Annex I.6, Part A, all graded against the rubric in Annex I.6, Part B. The reference programme is 25 hours (adaptable between 20 and 30), delivered in a blended, face-to-face, or fully online modality, with the session-by-session structure set out in Annex I.11. Together, the course and toolkit form a coherent pedagogical ecosystem supporting the translation of the EU-CIEMBLY model into educational practice.

IV. Conclusion

Task 6.6 ensures that the Assembly prototype not only remains at the institutional level but also generates long-term cultural change through education. It offers: (i) educational replication potential across EU Member States; (ii) capacity building among educators; (iii) transferability to national and local democratic contexts; (iv) an exploitable public output (the Toolkit and the training model) with a life beyond the funded project period;



(v) a basis for at least one peer-reviewed publication drawing on the empirical data collected in the Portuguese pilot.

On the one side, the Teacher Training Course provides a coherent European framework for preparing teachers to implement deliberative pedagogies grounded in democratic participation, inclusion and intersectionality. Through its modular structure, practice-based methodology and alignment with the EU-CIEMBLy Pedagogical Toolkit, the course enables adaptation across diverse educational systems while maintaining a shared pedagogical core.

The Pedagogical Toolkit, on the other hand, contributes to strengthening democratic competences among students, promoting inclusive participation in education, reinforcing the European dimension of curricula, supporting teachers in implementing innovative pedagogies, and producing a body of pilot data that feeds back into the EU-CIEMBLy research agenda.



References

- Barrett, M., Black, L., Byram, M., Faltyn, J., Gudmunson, L., Land, H., Lenz, C., Mompoin-Gaillard, P., Popović, M., Rus, C., Sala, S., Voskresenskaya, N. & Zgaga, P. (2018). *Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture, Vols. 1-3*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Bächtiger, A., Dryzek, J. S., Mansbridge, J. & Warren, M. E. (eds.) (2018). *The Oxford Handbook of Deliberative Democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Biesta, G. (2011). *Learning Democracy in School and Society*. Sense Publishers.
- Collins, P. H. & Bilge, S. (2020). *Intersectionality* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), 139–167.
- Karatzia, A., & O'Connor, N. (2025). Analytical and Normative Framework, EUCIEMBLY Deliverable 2.2., version 2. <https://www.eu-ciembly.eu/en/home>
- Kirkpatrick, J. D., & Kirkpatrick, W. K. (2016). *Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Training Evaluation*. Alexandria, VA: ATD Press.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Prentice-Hall.
- OECD (2020). *Innovative Citizen Participation and New Democratic Institutions: Catching the Deliberative Wave*. OECD Publishing.
- Osler, A. & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing Citizenship: Democracy and Inclusion in Education*. Open University Press.
- Sala, A., Punie, Y., Garkov, V. & Cabrera, M. (2020). *LifeComp: The European Framework for Personal, Social and Learning to Learn Key Competence*. JRC120911, European Commission.



ANNEX I: Toolkit Materials (Templates for Implementation)



Annex I.1: Student Participation Sheet

Class: _____

During the activity:

- I actively participated: ☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
- I listened carefully to others: ☐ Yes ☐ No
- I respected different opinions: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Reflection:

1. One idea that changed my way of thinking:

→ _____

2. One difficulty I experienced:

→ _____



Annex I.2. Teacher Observation Grid

Criteria	High	Medium	Low
Balanced participation	☐	☐	☐
Quality of arguments	☐	☐	☐
Respect for others	☐	☐	☐
Inclusion of diverse voices	☐	☐	☐

Notes:



Annex I.3: Inclusion Checklist

During the session:

- ☐ All students had the opportunity to speak
- ☐ Diverse perspectives were included
- ☐ The facilitator encouraged quieter students
- ☐ No dominant interruptions occurred
- ☐ The environment was respectful



Annex I.4: Recommendation Template

Theme: _____

Problem identified: _____

Proposal: _____

Justification: _____

Expected impact: _____



Annex I.5: Facilitation Guide

Before the activity:

- Define clear rules
- Prepare materials

During:

- Ensure balanced speaking time
- Intervene only when necessary
- Promote active listening

After:

- Facilitate critical reflection
- Identify participation patterns



Annex I.6: Assessment Framework

This annex provides the two assessment instruments of the EU-CIEMBLy model. The teacher uses Part A to assess student learning and the quality of the deliberative process in a School Citizens' Assembly. The trainer uses Part B to assess the three outputs produced by participants in the Teacher Training Course.

Part A – Student learning and process quality

This instrument assesses the process of deliberation, not the content of the opinions expressed.

Class/group: _____ Date: _____

Assembly theme: _____

A.1 Indicators

Indicator	Achieved	Partially	Not yet
Preparation and use of evidence	☐	☐	☐
Clarity and relevance of arguments	☐	☐	☐
Active listening	☐	☐	☐
Engagement with opposing views	☐	☐	☐
Contribution to shared decisions	☐	☐	☐
Respect for procedures and peers	☐	☐	☐
Critical self-reflection	☐	☐	☐

Achieved: the student consistently demonstrates the indicator and supports others in doing so.
Partially: the student demonstrates it occasionally or with support. Not yet: the indicator is not yet observable; targeted support is required.

A.2 Evidence collection methods



☐ Student Participation Sheet (Annex I.1)

☐ Teacher Observation Grid (Annex I.2)

☐ Inclusion Checklist (Annex I.3)

☐ Recommendation produced (Annex I.4)

☐ Peer feedback

☐ Other: _____

A.3 Process quality at group level

Question	Yes	Partially	No
Was the deliberation inclusive?	☐	☐	☐
Was a shared decision reached?	☐	☐	☐
Were the recommendations well justified?	☐	☐	☐
Were minority positions recorded?	☐	☐	☐

A.4 Feedback and teacher reflection

Strengths:

Areas to develop:

What would you change in the next assembly?

Part B – Assessment rubric for participant outputs



Applied to the three outputs required by the Teacher Training Course: the School Citizens' Assembly implementation plan (Annex I.7), the inclusion strategy (Annex I.8), and the assessment and evaluation framework (this annex, Part A).

Criterion	Excellent (A)	Proficient (B)	Developing (C)
Conceptual integration	Explicit, accurate and coherent application of deliberative democracy and intersectionality throughout the proposed intervention.	Frameworks are correctly referenced but only partially integrated into the design.	Frameworks are mentioned but not meaningfully operationalised.
Intersectional inclusion strategy	Specific, evidence-informed measures clearly address identified participation asymmetries in the target group.	Appropriate inclusion measures are proposed but without a systematic diagnosis of the specific context.	Inclusion is addressed only through generic statements, with no clear strategy.
Feasibility and implementation	Realistic planning, appropriate use of resources, institutional feasibility, and anticipation of potential implementation challenges.	The proposal is generally realistic, although implementation challenges are only partially considered.	The proposal lacks sufficient detail or is not feasible within the stated educational context.
Assessment and evaluation design	Indicators are appropriately selected from Part A and accompanied by clear evidence collection methods and evaluation procedures.	Relevant indicators are identified, but methods for collecting or interpreting evidence remain underdeveloped.	Indicators are absent, insufficiently justified or not linked to a coherent evaluation strategy.

B.1 Weighting of outputs

Output	Instrument	Weight
Output 1 – School Citizens' Assembly implementation plan	Annex I.7	40%



Output 2 – Inclusion strategy	Annex I.8	30%
Output 3 – Assessment and evaluation framework	Annex I.6, Part A	30%

Participation in synchronous sessions is a condition of certification (Annex I.11, Section 6) and is not a graded component.

B.2 Conversion to a quantitative scale

Level	Descriptor	1–10 scale
A – Excellent	All criteria at level A, or three at A and one at B	9–10
B – Proficient	Predominance of level B, with no criterion at C	7–8
C – Developing	One or more criteria at C; revision requested	5–6
Not certified	Outputs not submitted or attendance requirement not met	–



Annex I.7: School Citizens' Assembly Implementation Plan

Output 1 of the Teacher Training Course.

Teacher/participant:

School:

Class/group: _____ Number of students: _____

Subject(s) involved:

1. Theme of the Assembly

Question to be deliberated:

Why is this theme relevant for the students?

2. Curricular framing

Curricular area/learning outcomes addressed:

Implementation format: ☐ Single lesson ☐ Teaching unit ☐ Project ☐ Extracurricular activity

Assembly format (Module 4): ☐ Extended (3 sessions) ☐ Short (2 sessions) ☐ Compact (1 session)

Total duration: _____ Number of sessions: _____

National curricular anchor (from Annex I.13):



3. Organisation of the Assembly

Phase	Activity	Time	Materials
Preparation			
Understanding			
Deliberation			
Decision			
Follow-up			

Guidance on each phase is provided in Annex I.10.

4. Roles

Facilitator(s): _____ Observer(s): _____

Rapporteur(s): _____ Timekeeper(s): _____

How will roles be rotated or attributed?

Role cards are provided in Annex I.9.

5. Expected outputs

- ☐ Written recommendations (Annex I.4)
- ☐ Presentation to the school community
- ☐ Submission to the school board/student council
- ☐ Other:

6. Ethics and safeguarding

- ☐ Informed consent/assent obtained where required (Annex I.15)
- ☐ Data protection measures identified (Annex I.15)
- ☐ Sensitive-topic protocol considered (Annex I.15)



7. Anticipated difficulties and mitigation measures



Annex I.8: Inclusion Strategy

Output 2 of the Teacher Training Course.

Teacher/participant:

Class/group:

1. Diagnosis of participation

Based on the Teacher Observation Grid (Annex I.2) and the Inclusion Checklist (Annex I.3), identify the main participation asymmetries in the group:

Which students or groups tend to be silenced, interrupted or overlooked?

2. Intersectional dimensions to consider

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
| ☐ Gender | ☐ Socio-economic background | ☐ Migration background |
| ☐ Ethnicity | ☐ Language proficiency | ☐ Disability / SEN |
| ☐ Religion | ☐ Academic attainment | ☐ Other: |

Note how these dimensions overlap in this specific group:

3. Planned measures

Dimension	Barrier identified	Measure adopted
Access to the floor		



Language and vocabulary		
Materials and formats		
Group composition		
Physical/digital setting		

4. Facilitation techniques to be used

- ☐ Speaking rounds
 ☐ Think-pair-share
 ☐ Silent written input
☐ Speaking tokens
 ☐ Small-group first
 ☐ Anonymous contributions
☐ Rotating roles
 ☐ Co-facilitation by students
 ☐ Other: _____

Further guidance is provided in the Facilitation Guide (Annex I.5).

5. Indicators of success

How will you know the strategy has worked? Define at least two observable indicators.

Indicator 1:

Indicator 2:

6. Review

When and how will the strategy be reviewed?



Annex I.9: Role Cards

These cards are to be printed and distributed at the beginning of the assembly. Roles should be rotated across sessions so that all students experience each function.

Card 1 – Facilitator

Your task: to make the deliberation possible, not to give your own opinion.

- Open the session and recall the ground rules.
- Make sure everyone speaks at least once.
- Invite quieter participants: “What do you think about this?”
- Interrupt only to stop interruptions or disrespect.
- Summarise points of agreement and disagreement before moving on.

Avoid: taking sides, answering for others, letting one voice dominate.

Card 2 – Participant

Your task: to deliberate, which means listening in order to be able to change your mind.

- Give reasons for what you say, not only opinions.
- Refer to what others have said before adding your own point.
- Ask questions when something is unclear.
- Accept that your position may change during the discussion.

Avoid: repeating yourself, speaking over others, dismissing arguments without engaging with them.

Card 3 – Observer

Your task: to observe how the group deliberates, not what it decides.

- Record who speaks, how often and for how long.
- Note whether all voices were included.
- Note moments of good listening and moments of exclusion.



- Report your observations during the debriefing.

Tool: use the Teacher Observation Grid (Annex I.2) and the Inclusion Checklist (Annex I.3).

Card 4 – Rapporteur

Your task: to produce a faithful record of the deliberation.

- Write down the main arguments on each side.
- Record the points of agreement reached.
- Record the disagreements that remain open.
- Draft the final recommendation using Annex I.4.

Avoid: recording only the views you agree with.

Card 5 – Timekeeper

Your task: to protect the time of the group and the fairness of speaking time.

- Announce the time allocated to each phase.
- Signal when two minutes remain.
- Signal if one participant has spoken considerably more than others.

Avoid: cutting off a speaker abruptly without warning.

Card 6 – Expert/Resource person (optional)

Your task: to provide information, not conclusions.

- Present the evidence you prepared in a clear and balanced way.
- Answer factual questions from the group.
- State clearly when something is uncertain or contested.

Avoid: telling the group what it should decide.



Annex I.10: Guide to the Phases of Deliberation

This guide operationalises the phases of the EU-CIEMBLy Citizens' Assembly model in the classroom. Indicative timings are given for the Compact format (one session of 100 minutes). In the Short format (2 sessions), Phases 1 and 2 are separated; in the Extended format (3 sessions), each of Phases 1, 2 and 3 occupies its own session.

Phase 0 – Preparing (before the session, 20-30 min)

Purpose: to set the conditions for an inclusive deliberation.

- Formulate the question in an open and contestable way.
- Provide balanced background materials in accessible language.
- Agree the ground rules with the class and display them visibly.
- Distribute role cards (Annex I.9).
- Confirm consent and safeguarding requirements (Annex I.15).

Output: agreed rules, distributed roles, prepared materials.

Phase 1 – Understanding (25 min)

Purpose: to build a shared and informed basis for discussion.

- Present the question and the background evidence.
- Clarify concepts and vocabulary, using the glossary in Annex I.14.
- Students formulate questions in pairs before asking them in plenary.
- Identify who is affected by the issue and in what different ways.

Facilitation focus: ensure that no one is excluded by unfamiliar vocabulary.

Output: a shared list of key facts, concepts and open questions.

Phase 2 – Deliberating (40 min)

Purpose: to weigh arguments together, not to win a debate.

- Round 1: small groups (4–5 students) list arguments for and against.
- Round 2: plenary exchange, with a first speaking round in which everyone speaks once.



- Round 3: examine trade-offs - who gains, who loses, what is at stake.
- Identify convergences and remaining disagreements.

Facilitation focus: balance speaking time; explicitly invite perspectives that have not been heard.

Output: a mapped set of arguments, agreements and open disagreements.

Phase 3 – Recommending (20 min)

Purpose: to convert deliberation into a justified collective proposal.

- Draft one to three recommendations using Annex I.4.
- Decide by consensus where possible; record minority positions when not.
- Justify each recommendation with the reasons discussed.
- Define to whom the recommendation will be addressed.

Facilitation focus: never let a decision be reached by the loudest voices alone.

Output: written and justified recommendations, including minority positions.

Phase 4 – Debriefing and follow-up (15 min)

Purpose: to reflect on the process and to close the democratic loop.

- Students complete the Student Participation Sheet (Annex I.1).
- Observers report on participation patterns.
- Discuss: who spoke, who did not, and why?
- Agree how and when the recommendations will be transmitted and what response is expected.

Output: individual reflections, a shared assessment of inclusiveness, and a follow-up commitment.

Annex I.11: Course Programme and Delivery Modalities

This annex specifies the organisation of the 25-hour Teacher Training Course (deliverable 3.1, Task 6.6) for accreditation purposes. In Portugal, accreditation is sought through the *Centros de Formação de Associação de Escolas* (CFAE) or the *Associação de Professores de História* (APH).

1. General parameters

Parameter	Reference value	National adaptation band
Total duration	25 hours	20 to 30 hours
Delivery mode	Blended (recommended)	Face-to-face or fully online admissible
Synchronous share (blended)	$\geq 60\%$ (15h)	Adjustable to national CPD rules
Asynchronous share (blended)	$\leq 40\%$ (10h)	Reading, reflection tasks, materials review
Group size	18–24 teachers	12–30 admissible
Structure	Five sequential modules	Modules 1–4 European core; Module 5 nationally adapted

2. Distribution of hours per module

The distribution below applies the sub-timings set out in Section 6 of deliverable 3.1. In the blended modality, the synchronous share is 64%, above the 60% reference threshold; the remaining 36% is delivered asynchronously.

Module	Total	Synchro nous	Asynchro nous	Asynchronous components
M1. Deliberative Democracy and Citizens' Assemblies	4h	2.5h	1.5h	Input and reading (1h); individual reflection (0.5h)



M2. Intersectionality and Participation Inequalities	4h	2.5h	1.5h	Input and video vignettes (1h); application to own context (0.5h)
M3. Designing Inclusive Deliberative Spaces	5h	3.5h	1.5h	Input on facilitation (1h); consolidation (0.5h)
M4. School Citizens' Assemblies: Methodology and Practice	7h	5h	2h	Design workshop, individual component (2h)
M5. Implementation and Adaptation in National Contexts	5h	2.5h	2.5h	Presentation of the National Adaptation Grid (1h); individual planning (1.5h)
Total	25h	16h (64%)	9h (36%)	

In the face-to-face modality, all 25 hours are delivered in person. In the fully online modality, the same synchronous/asynchronous split is maintained, with shorter and more frequent synchronous sessions.

3. Modality A – Blended (recommended)

Sixteen synchronous hours in five sessions, complemented by nine hours of asynchronous work distributed between sessions.

Sessi on	Durati on	Synchronous content	Asynchronous work before the session
S1	3h	M1 (2.5h): deliberative experience, debrief and conceptualisation. M2 (0.5h): opening.	M1 input and reading (1h)
S2	3h	M2 (2h): group case analysis and cross-group discussion. M3 (1h): facilitation practice.	M1 individual reflection (0.5h); M2 input and video vignettes (1h)

S3	3h	M3 (2.5h): role simulation, peer feedback, rotation. M4 (0.5h): structure, roles and formats.	M2 application to own context (0.5h); M3 input on facilitation (1h)
S4	4h	M4 Block A (3h): mini-assembly simulation. M4 Block B (1h): debriefing and critical reflection.	M3 consolidation (0.5h)
S5	3h	M4 Block C (0.5h): design workshop, plenary. M5 (2.5h): curricular mapping, peer review.	M4 design workshop, individual component (2h); M5 presentation of the grid (1h)

Following S5, participants complete the individual planning of Module 5 (1.5h asynchronous), submit the three outputs and complete the course evaluation questionnaire (Annex I.12).

4. Modality B – Face-to-face

Twenty-five contact hours in six sessions. Suitable for concentrated delivery (for example, one full week) or for weekly sessions across a school term.

Session	Duration	Content
S1	4h	Module 1 – Deliberative Democracy and Citizens' Assemblies
S2	4h	Module 2 – Intersectionality and Participation Inequalities
S3	5h	Module 3 – Designing Inclusive Deliberative Spaces
S4	4h	Module 4, Blocks A and B – Mini-assembly simulation and debriefing
S5	3h	Module 4, Block C – Design workshop
S6	5h	Module 5 – National and disciplinary adaptation

5. Modality C – Fully online

Sixteen synchronous hours in eight sessions of two hours in a videoconference environment, plus nine hours of asynchronous work on a learning platform.



Sessions	Duration	Content	Asynchronous component
S1	2h	Module 1	Input and reading (1h)
S2	2h	Module 1 (closing) and Module 2	Individual reflection (0.5h); video vignettes (1h)
S3	2h	Module 2 (closing) and opening of Module 3	Application to own context (0.5h)
S4	2h	Module 3	Input on facilitation (1h)
S5	2h	Module 3 (closing) and Module 4, Block A	Consolidation (0.5h)
S6	2h	Module 4, Block A (online assembly simulation)	–
S7	2h	Module 4, Blocks B and C; opening of Module 5	Design workshop (2h)
S8	2h	Module 5	Grid and individual planning (2.5h)

Specific requirements: breakout rooms for small-group deliberation; a shared collaborative document for the rapporteur function; cameras recommended but not mandatory, with alternative participation channels (chat, written contributions) guaranteed in accordance with Annex I.8.

6. Assessment and certification

Assessment is practice-based and applies the rubric in Annex I.6, Part B, to the three participant outputs. Weightings are specified in Annex I.6, Section B.1.

Attendance requirement: a minimum of two-thirds of the synchronous hours (11 of 16 hours in the blended and online modalities; 17 of 25 hours in the face-to-face modality).

Certification is conditional on meeting the attendance requirement and submitting the three outputs. The final classification is expressed on a 1–10 quantitative scale in accordance with the applicable national CPD regulations; the conversion table is provided in Annex I.6, Section B.2.

7. Trainer profile

- Higher education qualification in Education, Social Sciences or a related field.
- Documented experience in participatory or deliberative methodologies.



- Familiarity with the EU-CIEMBLy Pedagogical Toolkit (deliverable 3.2).
- Co-facilitation is recommended for groups of more than 24 participants.

8. Resources required

- Room allowing circular or modular seating (face-to-face and blended modalities).
- Printed set of Annexes I.1 to I.16 for each participant.
- Role cards (Annex I.9), printed and cut, one set per group of six.
- Videoconference platform with breakout rooms (online and blended modalities).

Annex I.12: Course Evaluation Questionnaire (completed by participants)

To be completed at the end of the course. Responses are anonymous and are used to produce the training evaluation report and to revise the course.

Course: EU-CIEMBLy Teacher Training Course

Modality: ☐ Blended ☐ Face-to-face ☐ Fully online

Dates: _____ Location / platform: _____

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree | 2 = disagree | 3 = neither agree nor disagree | 4 = agree | 5 = strongly agree

A. Organisation

Item	1	2	3	4	5
The objectives of the course were clearly communicated.					
The duration was adequate for the content covered.					
The balance between synchronous and asynchronous work was appropriate.					
Logistical conditions (room/platform) were adequate.					



B. Contents

Item	1	2	3	4	5
The contents were relevant to my professional practice.					
The sequence of the five modules was coherent.					
The theoretical framing was clear and accessible.					
The balance between theory and practice was appropriate.					
The Experience–Reflect–Conceptualise–Apply cycle was visible in each module.					

C. Methodology and facilitation

Item	1	2	3	4	5
The trainer demonstrated command of the subject matter.					
The methodology encouraged the participation of all.					
I felt able to express disagreement during the sessions.					
The mini-assembly simulation was a useful learning experience.					
The debriefing helped me to reflect on my own practice.					

D. Materials

Item	1	2	3	4	5
------	---	---	---	---	---



The annexes and templates are clear and usable.					
The National Adaptation Grid helped me to situate the model in my curriculum.					
The materials are adaptable to my teaching context.					
I will use these materials with my students.					

E. Transfer to practice

Item	1	2	3	4	5
I feel able to facilitate a School Citizens' Assembly.					
I feel able to choose between the Extended, Short and Compact formats.					
I feel able to identify participation inequalities in my class.					
I feel able to handle the ethical and safeguarding requirements involved.					
I intend to implement an assembly during the current school year.					

F. Overall assessment

Overall classification of the course (1 to 10): _____

Would you recommend this course to a colleague? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

G. Open questions

1. What was most useful to you in this course?



2. What was least useful, or what should be changed?

3. What obstacles do you anticipate in implementing an assembly in your school?

4. What further support would you need after the course?

H. Participant profile (optional, for statistical purposes only)

Teaching level: ☐ Primary ☐ Lower secondary ☐ Upper secondary ☐ Other

Subject area: _____ Years of service: _____

Previous experience with participatory methodologies: ☐ None ☐ Some ☐ Extensive

Thank you for your contribution.

Annex I.13: National Adaptation Grid (Module 5)

This grid is the companion instrument for Module 5 and forms part of the Adaptation Framework (Toolkit Part III). It supports transferring the School Citizens' Assembly model to different national education systems, while Modules 1 to 4 remain the shared European core of the programme.



Part A – National curricular anchoring

Dimension	Portugal (example)	Spain	Italy	Belgium
Legal basis of the curriculum	Decreto-Lei n.º 55/2018, of 6 July	Ley Orgánica 3/2020, de 29 de diciembre, por la que se modifica la Ley Orgánica 2/2006, de 3 de mayo, de Educación. https://www.boe.es/eli/es/lo/2020/12/29/3/dof/spa/pdf	D.P.R. 275/1999	In Belgium, the legal basis for teachers' qualifications is anchored in the Flemish Codex Higher Education, specifically regarding the decreed basic competencies.
Citizenship education component	Cidadania e Desenvolvimento (Article 15), a compulsory curricular component across all educational offers	“El currículo irá orientado a facilitar el desarrollo educativo de los alumnos y alumnas, garantizando su formación integral, contribuyendo al pleno desarrollo de su personalidad y preparándoles para el ejercicio pleno de los derechos humanos, de una ciudadanía activa y democrática en la sociedad actual.” (Art.6.2 about curriculum) (p.16 of the	Law 20 August 2019, n. 92	In Flanders there is a Key Competence, Citizenship explicitly all secondary schools have to prove that pupils acquire specific, measurable learning outcomes.



		PDF document mentioned above)).		
National strategy	Estratégia Nacional de Educação para a Cidadania (ENEC), revised by Resolução do Conselho de Ministros n.º 127/2025	Cívica education is integrated into the curriculum in connection with the key competence Citizenship Education (Competencia ciudadana) There is one subject called “Educación en Valores Cívicos y Éticos” in Primary and Secondary Education (in the case of secondary: La materia de Educación en Valores Cívicos y Éticos tiene que ser cursada por todo el alumnado en uno de los cuatro cursos de la etapa, siendo posible cursarla en alguno de los tres primeros cursos) There are also connections with History education, since on of the specific	D.M. n. 183/2024 (National Guidelines for Civic Education)	In the Flemish region, the implementation of inclusive participation and educational modules directly aligns with: 1. The Strategic Alignment, the current Flemish approach emphasizes active participation, critical thinking and open dialogue. 2. Project connection : the training course directly implements this national strategy by giving local trainers and educators the tools to handle controversial topics.



		competences of the “Geography and History” subject is: “5. Analizar de forma crítica planteamientos históricos y geográficos explicando la construcción de los sistemas democráticos y los principios constitucionales que rigen la vida en comunidad, así como asumiendo los deberes y derechos propios de nuestro marco de convivencia, para promover la participación ciudadana y la cohesión social.”		
Mandatory domains most directly mobilised	Human Rights; Democracy and Political Institutions; Media; Pluralism and Cultural Diversity	Specific competence of “Educación en Valores Cívicos y Éticos”: “2. Actuar e interactuar de acuerdo con normas y valores cívicos y éticos, a partir del reconocimiento fundado de su importancia para regular la	Constitution; Economic Development and Sustainability (including environmental protection; road safety education; financial education; economic development and entrepreneurshi	The project activates and mobilizes educators in school as primary actors to trigger a cascading chain reaction among pupils, families and policy makers.



		vida comunitaria y su aplicación efectiva y justificada en distintos contextos, para promover una convivencia pacífica, respetuosa, democrática y comprometida con el bien común.” Assesment criteria connected to this competence: students should be able to... “2.2. Fomentar el ejercicio de la ciudadanía activa y democrática a través del conocimiento del movimiento asociativo y la participación respetuosa, dialogante y constructiva en actividades de grupo que impliquen tomar decisiones colectivas, planificar acciones coordinadas y resolver problemas aplicando procedimientos	p; protection of common goods); and Digital Citizenship	
--	--	--	--	--



		y principios cívicos, éticos y democráticos explícitos. 2.3. Contribuir a generar un compromiso activo con el bien común a través del análisis y la toma razonada y dialogante de posición en torno a cuestiones éticas de actualidad como la lucha contra la desigualdad y la pobreza, el derecho al trabajo, la salud, la educación y la justicia, así como sobre los fines y límites éticos de la investigación científica.” Basic knowledge established by the curriculum: “B. Sociedad, justicia y democracia: - Las virtudes del diálogo y las normas de argumentación. La resolución pacífica de		
--	--	--	--	--



		conflictos. La empatía con los demás. (...) - La democracia: principios, procedimientos e instituciones. (...) - Asociacionismo y voluntariado. La ciudadanía y la participación democrática.” Assessment criteria in the case of “Geography and History”, specific competence 5: “5.2. Reconocer movimientos y causas que generen una conciencia solidaria, promuevan la cohesión social, y trabajen para la eliminación de la desigualdad, especialmente la motivada por cuestión de género, y para el pleno desarrollo de la ciudadanía, mediante la movilización de conocimientos y estrategias de		
--	--	--	--	--



		participación, trabajo en equipo, mediación y resolución pacífica de conflictos.” Basic knowledge for this subject: Under the title “C. Compromiso cívico local y global” it is mentioned: “Compromiso cívico y participación ciudadana. Mediación y gestión pacífica de conflictos y apoyo a las víctimas de la violencia y del terrorismo.”		
National competence framework	Perfil dos Alunos à Saída da Escolaridade Obrigatória – critical and creative thinking; interpersonal relations; information and communication; citizenship and participation	Perfil de salida del alumnado al término de la enseñanza básica https://educagob.es/educacion/fpydeportes/gob.es/curriculo/curriculo-lomloe/menu-curriculos-basicos/ed-secundaria-obligatoria/perfil-salida.html Prepare students to face	Profilo dello studente (D.M. n. 221/2025) - Citizenship competence: understanding the importance of civil, peaceful and supportive coexistence for the common good; expressing personal opinions while respecting others; participating in civic and social	1. Teachers Competence Framework: enhancing the teacher’s ability to handle diverse classrooms and create a safe inclusive learning environment. 2. Student key Competence: Providing teachers with concrete methodologies, needed to help students with democratic dialogue



		some of the challenges they will encounter, e.g.: - Desarrollar un espíritu crítico, empático y proactivo para detectar situaciones de inequidad y exclusión a partir de la comprensión de las causas complejas que las originan. -Entender los conflictos como elementos connaturales a la vida en sociedad que deben resolverse de manera pacífica. - Cooperar y convivir en sociedades abiertas y cambiantes, valorando la diversidad personal y cultural como fuente de riqueza e interesándose por otras lenguas y culturas. - Sentirse parte de un proyecto colectivo, tanto	life; understanding basic social, economic, legal and political structures and concepts; respecting different identities and cultural and religious traditions; and acting responsibly towards the environment and common goods.	conflict management, understanding human rights and active participation.
--	--	---	---	--



		en el ámbito local como en el global, desarrollando empatía y generosidad.		
Space for interdisciplinary work	Curricular Autonomy Domains - Domínios de Autonomia Curricular (DAC)	Education Law recognises the autonomy of centres to adopt pedagogical innovations and educational programs. There is flexibility to carry out interdisciplinary projects in school, where subjects can collaborate in projects (e.g. History and Languages – ámbito sociolingüístico, or project-based learning combining History and Civics,...). Interdisciplinary projects are promoted as a means to implement competence-based learning.	Under the teaching autonomy granted by Article 4 of Presidential Decree No. 275/1999, schools may aggregate subjects into disciplinary areas and organise educational pathways involving multiple subjects and activities	In Flanders, school autonomy provides scope for interdisciplinary projects linking citizenship education with subjects such as History, Languages and Social Sciences. School Citizens' Assemblies could bring these subjects together through activities involving critical thinking, democratic dialogue and collective decision-making, contributing to citizenship learning outcomes.
Assessment rules to observe	Formative assessment predominant; Cidadania e Desenvolvimento assessed in	Competence-based assessment. Formative assessment, sometimes also	Formative and educational function of assessment; civic education subject to	The training course assessment must follow the internal quality assurance systems of Flemish higher education



	descriptive terms in basic education	periodic and final assessment.	periodic and final assessment; synthetic judgements in primary school and numerical marks out of ten in lower secondary education.	institutions or recognised professional development bodies.
Accredited or qualified CPD providers	<i>Centros de Formação de Associação de Escolas (CFAE)</i> or <i>Associação de Professores de História (APH)</i>	In Spain, there are accredited universities that offer CPD courses; the Ministry of Education has the INTEF (Instituto Nacional de Tecnologías Educativas y de Formación del Profesorado); there are also some teacher unions and associations in different autonomous communities which provide CPD. In the case of the Basque Country, these could be Berritzegunea and Ikastolen Elkarte; the first one depends directly on educational authorities, the	Accredited or qualified CPD providers, including professional associations, universities, schools and school networks, pursuant to Directive No. 170/2016. The Ministry of Education and Merit (MIM) publishes the official lists of accredited and qualified providers; the most recent list identified is dated August 2023.	Universities organise development and teachers training.



		second is an association of Basque schools, and both work in teacher training.		
Institutional opportunities and constraints for implementing School Citizens' Assemblies	Opportunities: The compulsory <i>Citizenship and Development</i> component, the National Strategy for Citizenship Education, and the curricular flexibility provided through school autonomy and <i>Curricular Autonomy Domains</i> offer a favourable framework for interdisciplinary and participatory initiatives. Constraints: limited curriculum time, workload pressures, uneven teacher training and institutional support, differences in school resources and leadership engagement, and difficulties in integrating and assessing	Opportunities: The compulsory subject “Educación en Valores Cívicos y Éticos” and even the subject of “Geografía e Historia” in Secondary Education offer the opportunity to introduce interdisciplinary and participatory projects to promote active citizenship, especially within the context of a competence based education model. Constraints: limited time and extensive curriculum, lack of confidence of teachers due to lack of training and avoidance of potentially	Opportunities: The compulsory Civic Education component, strengthened by the 2024 National Guidelines for Civic Education, and the curricular flexibility provided through school autonomy offer a favourable framework for interdisciplinary and participatory initiatives. Constraints: limited curriculum time, workload pressures, uneven teacher training and institutional support, differences in school resources and leadership engagement, and the need to plan such activities before the beginning of the school year,	The current Flemish educational goals explicitly mandat secondary schools to foster democratic dialogue, political literacy and civic participation. School boards in Flanders enjoy high institutional autonomy. Most Flemisch schools already have functioning students councils.



	assembly-based activities within existing curricular requirements.	controversial issues.	since schools often have limited scope to modify their activity plans during the academic year.	
--	--	-----------------------	---	--



Part B – Disciplinary alignment

To be completed for each subject in which an assembly will be implemented. The European competence anchors refer to the Council of Europe RFCDC and to the LifeComp framework, as set out in Section 5 of deliverable 3.1.

Subject	National learning outcomes	RFCDC / LifeComp anchor	Possible assembly theme	Format	Assessment
History					
Citizenship Education					
Social Sciences					
Languages					
Other: _____					

Worked example (Portugal, History, lower secondary)

Field	Content
National learning outcomes	Aprendizagens Essenciais – História: interpreting historical sources; recognising the plurality of perspectives on the past
RFCDC / LifeComp anchor	RFCDC: analytical and critical thinking; knowledge and critical understanding of politics, law and democracy. LifeComp: Social – communication
Assembly theme	How should the colonial past be represented in our school?
Format	Short format (2 sessions), articulated with Cidadania e Desenvolvimento
Assessment	Annex I.6, Part A, with emphasis on the use of evidence and engagement with opposing views



Funded by
the European Union



Part C – Assembly format and implementation format

Two independent choices must be made: the assembly format (Module 4) determines how the deliberative cycle is distributed across sessions; the implementation format determines how it is inserted into school organisation.

C.1 Assembly format

Format	Sessions	Deliberative cycle	When to choose it
Extended	3	One session per phase: understanding, deliberation, decision	Complex or contested themes; classes with prior experience of deliberation
Short	2	Understanding and deliberation in session 1; decision in session 2	The default option for most curricular contexts
Compact	1	All phases within a single session of 90 minutes	First experience; tight timetabling; narrowly defined themes

C.2 Implementation format

Format	Duration	Advantages	Requirements
Single lesson	50–90 min	Low institutional threshold; easy to repeat	Compact assembly format; strong pre-preparation
Teaching unit	3–5 lessons	Allows the full deliberative cycle	Stable timetabling
Interdisciplinary project	One term	Deep engagement; authentic outputs	Coordination between teachers; DAC or equivalent
Extracurricular activity	Variable	Freedom of theme and format	Voluntary participation may reproduce inequalities



Annex I.14: Glossary of Key Concepts

This glossary supports Modules 1 and 2 and may be distributed to students in an adapted form. Definitions are deliberately short and operational; they are intended to enable participation, not to close conceptual debate.

Most of definitions draw from the Glossary developed under the EU-CIEMBLY project, available at <https://www.eu-ciembly.eu/en/glossary>, but are adapted to this specific context.

Aggregative democracy. A model of democracy that adds up pre-existing preferences, typically through voting. Contrasted with deliberative democracy, in which preferences may be transformed through discussion.

Assent. The agreement of a child or young person to take part in an activity, expressed in terms they understand. It complements, and does not replace, the informed consent of a parent or legal guardian.

Citizens' Assembly. Type of mini-public that brings together randomly selected participants, according to socio-demographic criteria, to engage in an open and informed deliberation on a given policy issue and to produce recommendations.

Consensus. Method of decision-making according to which a proposal will only be adopted if all persons are not in disagreement. Consensus decisions or recommendations are built through dialogue, compromise, and mutual understanding and not through formal voting.

Deliberation. Collective reasoning in which participants exchange justified arguments and remain open to changing their position. It differs from debate, whose aim is to win, and from conversation, which has no decision to reach.

Deliberative democracy. Process of active engagement and direct deliberation by citizens amongst themselves or with the participation of other stakeholders on a substantive policy or legislative area.

Democratic innovation. An institutional arrangement designed to deepen citizen participation in political decision-making beyond conventional electoral mechanisms.

Epistemic injustice. A wrong done to a person specifically in their capacity as a knower: when their testimony is given less credibility because of who they are, or when they lack the concepts to make sense of their own experience.

Exclusion (internal). Being formally present in a discussion but unable to influence it, because of language, register, timing or status. Distinguished from external exclusion, which is the absence from the room.

Facilitation. The function of enabling a group to deliberate well. The facilitator is a trained professional who contribute to the functioning of the assembly's deliberative process without taking direct part in it. The facilitator is responsible for the process, not for the content or the outcome.



Ground rules. Procedural rules agreed by the group before deliberation begins, governing speaking time, respect and confidentiality. Their legitimacy derives from having been agreed rather than imposed.

Inclusion. Integration and participation of all persons in decision-making regardless of background, identity, abilities, or differences, according to the principles of non-discrimination and equality. Inclusion is measured by voice, not by attendance.

Intersectionality. The unique experiences of discriminations and privileges that come from being a member of more than one marginalised group. It describes an analytical framework, that shows that systems of inequality such as gender, class, race, disability and migration status interact and produce specific experiences that cannot be understood by considering each dimension separately.

LifeComp. The European Framework for Personal, Social and Learning to Learn Key Competence, developed by the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission. Organised in three areas: Personal, Social and Learning.

Minority position. A view that did not prevail in a decision but is formally recorded. Recording it is a condition of deliberative quality, not a failure of the process.

Mini-publics. Deliberative body composed of selected persons representing subsets of the socio-economic structure that aims to foster equal participation in democratic life and in decision-making processes.

Participation asymmetry. A systematic and patterned inequality in who speaks, who is heard and who influences decisions within a group.

Power relations. The unequal distribution of the capacity to define what counts as a legitimate question, a valid argument or an acceptable outcome. Present in every classroom, including apparently open ones.

Recommendation. The written output of an assembly, containing a proposal, its justification and its addressee. It is not binding, but it requires a response.

Reflexivity. The capacity of participants, and of the teacher, to examine their own position, assumptions and influence within the deliberative process.

RFCDc. The Council of Europe Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture, organised in four categories: values, attitudes, skills, and knowledge and critical understanding.

Safeguarding. The set of measures that protect children and young people from harm during an educational activity, including the handling of sensitive topics and the protection of personal data.

Silencing. The set of mechanisms, often unintentional, through which certain voices are discouraged, interrupted, trivialised or rendered inaudible.

Sortition. Selection by lot, used in Citizens' Assemblies to obtain a group that reflects the diversity of a population rather than the willingness of the most motivated to volunteer.



Student voice. The recognition of students as legitimate participants in decisions about their education. It becomes tokenistic when opinions are gathered without any effect on decisions.

Tokenism. The appearance of participation without the transfer of any real influence. A frequent risk in school participation structures.

Trade-off. A situation in which two valued goods cannot both be fully achieved, so that a justified choice between them must be made. Identifying trade-offs is a central task of the deliberation phase.



Annex I.15: Ethics and Safeguarding

This annex is used in Module 4. It applies whenever a School Citizens' Assembly is implemented with children or young people. National legislation and institutional regulations of each school establishment prevail over this annex wherever they are more demanding.

1. Pre-implementation checklist

Requirement	Done	Notes
School management informed and activity authorised	☐	
Informed consent of parents or legal guardians obtained, where required	☐	
Informed assent of students obtained	☐	
Students informed that participation is voluntary and may be withdrawn	☐	
Alternative activity available for non-participating students	☐	
Data protection measures defined (see Section 3)	☐	
Sensitive-topic protocol reviewed (see Section 4)	☐	
Referral route to the Ethics Advisory Board known to the teacher	☐	

2. Informed consent and assent

2.1 Model text – information for parents or legal guardians

Dear parent or legal guardian,

Your child's class will take part in a School Citizens' Assembly, an educational activity in which students deliberate on a question of common interest and produce written recommendations. The activity is part of the EU-CIEMBLY project (Horizon Europe, GA 101132694) and takes place during school hours, under the supervision of the teacher identified below.



Theme of the assembly:

Dates and duration:

Responsible teacher:

Participation is voluntary. Your child may withdraw at any moment without any consequence for their assessment. Personal data collected are limited to what is strictly necessary and are handled in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2016/679.

☐ I authorise the participation of my child in the activity.

☐ I authorise the recording of images or audio for internal pedagogical purposes only.

☐ I authorise the use of anonymised outputs for project reporting and dissemination.

Name of the student:

Name and signature of the parent or legal guardian:

Date: _____

2 Model text – student assent

Your class is going to hold a Citizens' Assembly. You will discuss a question with your classmates, listen to different points of view and help to write a set of recommendations.

Taking part is your choice. You can stop at any time, and nothing bad will happen. What you say will not be graded as a right or wrong opinion. Your name will not appear in any report outside the school.

☐ I want to take part. ☐ I do not want to take part.

Name: _____ Date: _____

3. Data protection

Data type	Purpose	Retention	Measures
-----------	---------	-----------	----------



Participation records (Annexes I.1–I.3)	Formative assessment	End of school year	Stored in the school; not shared with the project
Recommendations produced (Annex I.4)	Pedagogical output; project reporting	Duration of the project	Anonymised before leaving the school
Photographs and audio-visual material	Internal pedagogical use; dissemination if authorised	As authorised	Separate authorisation; faces blurred if not authorised
Teacher outputs (Annexes I.6–I.8)	Course assessment and accreditation	As required by the accrediting body	Held by the training centre

No special categories of personal data within the meaning of Article 9 of the GDPR are to be collected. Students must never be asked to disclose their ethnicity, religion, health status, sexual orientation or migration status as a condition of participation, even when the assembly theme touches on these dimensions.

4. Sensitive and controversial topics

- Announce the theme in advance so that no student is taken by surprise.
- Establish that personal experience may be shared but is never required.
- Agree explicitly that what is said in the room stays in the room.
- Frame the question around policies and institutions rather than around individuals present.
- Provide a discreet way for a student to withdraw from a discussion.
- Close the session properly; never leave a difficult discussion unresolved at the bell.

Guidance on managing disagreement is provided in the Facilitation Guide (Annex I.5).

5. Referral procedure

Where an ethical question arises that is not covered by this annex, or where an unforeseen situation occurs during an assembly, the teacher should: (i) suspend the activity if there is any



risk to a student; (ii) inform the school management; and (iii) refer the question, through the national partner, to the EU-CIEMBLy Ethics Advisory Board.



Annex I.16: Structured Debate Guide (Module 1)

This annex is the facilitation script for the deliberative experience of Module 1 (Section 6.1 of deliverable 3.1): 1.5 hours of deliberative experience followed by 1 hour of debriefing and conceptualisation. It is used by the trainer with course participants and may afterwards be adapted by participants for use with their own students.

1. Question and purpose

Question to be deliberated: “Should students have a greater role in school decision-making?”

The purpose is not to reach the correct answer but to allow participants to experience the four principles of deliberative democracy – inclusion, publicity, reason-giving and respect – before these are named and theorised in the debriefing.

2. Deliberation is not competitive debate

Dimension	Competitive debate	Structured deliberation
Aim	To win the argument	To reach a justified shared decision
Position	Assigned and defended throughout	May legitimately change
Success	Persuading the audience	Understanding trade-offs and justifying a choice
Disagreement	Eliminated by victory	Recorded as a minority position
Outcome	A winner	A recommendation with reasons

State this distinction explicitly at the start; many participants and most students arrive with the competitive model in mind.

3. Preparation

- Groups of six. With 18–24 participants, this gives three to four groups.
- Circular or modular seating; no frontal arrangement.



- Materials: role cards (Annex I.9), the three briefing cards in Section 6 below, one sheet per group for the proposal, timer, and the Teacher Observation Grid (Annex I.2) for the trainer.

- Write the question and the ground rules where everyone can see them.

4. Sequence of the deliberative experience (90 minutes)

Phase	Time	What the facilitator does	What participants do
1. Framing and ground rules	10 min	Present the question, the distinction in Section 2 and the sequence. Agree the ground rules with the group rather than imposing them.	Agree speaking time, the right to pass, confidentiality and the rule that positions may change.
2. Silent positioning	5 min	Ask each participant to write their initial position and one reason for it. Collect nothing; the note is kept for Phase 8.	Write individually. No discussion.
3. Information input	10 min	Distribute the three briefing cards (Section 6). Clarify facts only; do not evaluate arguments.	Read the three perspectives and note one point that surprised them.
4. Opening speaking round	10 min	Give each participant one uninterrupted minute in turn. Enforce the rule of no interruption and no reply during the round.	State a position and one reason. Listen to the other five without responding.
5. Guided exchange	20 min	Ask for arguments to be addressed rather than persons. Intervene only to redistribute the floor and to ask for reasons: "on what grounds?"	Discuss in the group of six, connecting to what has already been said.
6. Trade-offs and proposal	20 min	Ask each group to name at least one genuine trade-off before drafting. Require the reasons, not only the proposal.	Draft one proposal on the sheet, with its justification and its addressee.



7. Plenary presentation	10 min	Three minutes per group. No cross-examination at this stage.	The rapporteur of each group presents the proposal and its reasons.
8. Decision and minority positions	5 min	Test for convergence between the group proposals. Record explicitly any position that did not prevail.	Compare the final position with the note from Phase 2 and indicate whether it changed and why.

Total: 90 minutes. In the fully online modality, Phases 5 and 6 run in breakout rooms and the group sheet is a shared collaborative document.

5. Debriefing and conceptualisation (60 minutes)

The debriefing is where the experience becomes conceptual content. It is not optional and should not be shortened.

Stage	Time	Guiding questions
D1. Immediate reactions	5 min	How did it feel? What was harder than expected?
D2. Quality of the process	20 min	Inclusion: who spoke and for how long? Publicity: were the reasons stated openly? Reason-giving: were positions justified or merely asserted? Respect: how was disagreement handled?
D3. Participation asymmetries	15 min	Who found it easy to take the floor and why? What effect did the speaking round have on those who tend to remain silent? What would have happened without it?
D4. Conceptualisation	15 min	Name the four principles and the phases just experienced (preparation, understanding, deliberation, decision). Introduce Citizens' Assemblies as democratic innovations and situate the EU-CIEMBL Y framework.
D5. Transfer	5 min	What would you change to run this with your own students? Set the individual reflection task (0.5h asynchronous).



D3 is the deliberate bridge to Module 2: the asymmetries observed in the room are the object of the following module.

6. Briefing cards

Distribute the three cards together. They are deliberately balanced, and none of them states the position of the project.

Card	Content
A – The case for a greater role	Students are affected daily by decisions they do not take part in. Participation develops civic competences that cannot be acquired through instruction alone. Schools that consult students report better implementation of the decisions taken. Democratic legitimacy is not a function of age.
B – The case for caution	Some decisions require technical or legal expertise. Consultation without effect produces cynicism rather than civic learning. Participation structures may be captured by the most confident students. Teachers and school leaders carry legal responsibility for outcomes.
C – The question of scope	The real question may be which decisions rather than how much. Distinguish being informed, being consulted, deciding jointly and deciding autonomously. The same school may operate at different levels for the curriculum, for assessment, for school rules and for the use of spaces.

7. Common difficulties

Difficulty	Response
One or two participants dominate	Return to the speaking round format; introduce speaking tokens; ask explicitly for those who have not yet spoken.
The group converges too quickly	Ask for the strongest objection to the emerging position; assign the role of critical friend (Annex I.9).
The discussion becomes personal	Reformulate the point as a question about rules or institutions, not about persons in the room.



No reasons are given	Ask systematically: on what grounds? What would make you change your mind?
Participants slip into competitive debate	Recall Section 2; state that changing position will be recorded as a strength, not a concession.
Time runs short	Reduce Phase 5, never Phase 6 or the debriefing. A deliberation without a justified outcome teaches the wrong lesson.

8. Adaptation for use with students

- Keep the phase structure and the speaking round; these carry the inclusion effect.
- Replace the question with one over which the students have genuine influence.
- Compact format (1 session): Phases 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7, with a shortened debriefing.
- Use the Student Participation Sheet (Annex I.1) and record the outcome in the Recommendation Template (Annex I.4).
- Apply Annex I.15 where the theme touches on sensitive dimensions.



ANNEX II: Deliberative Scenarios

Assembly 1: Climate Action

Theme: Should the EU enforce stricter climate policies even if they impact economic growth?

Key focus:

- Climate targets
- Economic vs environmental impact
- Climate justice

Reflection:

Who benefits and who is disadvantaged by these policies?

Assembly 2: Artificial Intelligence

Theme: Should the EU strictly regulate artificial intelligence, even if it slows innovation?

Key focus:

- AI risks and opportunities
- Privacy and surveillance
- Digital inequalities

Reflection:

Can artificial intelligence ever be neutral?

Assembly 3: Social Inequality

Theme: Should the EU implement stronger policies to reduce social inequalities?

Key focus:

- Access to education, health and work
- Redistribution policies
- Social justice

Reflection:

What is the difference between equality and equity?