

EVENT DESCRIPTION SHEET

(To be filled in and uploaded as deliverable in the Portal Grant Management System, at the due date foreseen in the system.)

 Please provide one sheet per event (one event = one workpackage = one lump sum.)

PROJECT	
Participant:	ACTIONAID HELLAS ASTIKI MI KERDOSKOPIKI ETAIRIA (AAH)
PIC number:	931941954
Project name and acronym:	YOULEAD - Youth Leaders advocates for Greener Europe

EVENT DESCRIPTION			
Event number:	WP15		
Event name:	Final national debate contest for delegates students in Greece		
Type:	Conference		
In situ/online:	in-situ		
Location:	Greece – Athens		
Date(s):	28/06/2023		
Website(s) (if any):	ActionAid Website		
Participants			
Female:	63		
Male:	32		
Non-binary:	-		
From country 1 [Greece]:	95		
Total number of participants:	95	From total number of countries:	1
Description			
<i>Provide a short description of the event and its activities.</i>			
<p>The final national debating contest "You Lead" was held on June 28, 2023, in Athens, Greece. In total, 95 people took part, with 62 being students and 33 being educators, volunteers, or ActionAid professionals. ActionAid Hellas planned and carried out the debate event with the support of the Hellenic Association of Rhetoric in Education, the school administration of the 1st General High School of Papagos, and a number of volunteers.</p> <p>Originally planned as a two-day event, the logistics of coordinating the participation of multiple schools from different regions of Greece necessitated a larger budget. To ensure adherence to the allocated budget, the organizing committee made the decision to condense the two rounds of the debate into a single-day event, effectively avoiding any potential budgetary overruns.</p>			

The final national debating competition brought together the students with the highest scores from the local debating competitions held in Corinth, Kalamata, Athens, and Rethymno, giving them a stage to demonstrate their exceptional debating skills. From this extraordinary pool of candidates, the top 20 participants with the highest scores were selected to advance to the next phases of the project.

These 20 finalists will have the opportunity to participate in the European preparatory online exchange meeting for school students (WP18) and contribute to the formulation of the Common Manifesto (WP19). Moreover, five exceptional individuals from this group were chosen to represent their country at the esteemed European Youth Conference in Brussels (WP20 & WP21).

Prior to the contest, An ActionAid Hellas representative introduced the "You Lead", outlining its essential concepts, procedures, expected outcomes and next steps.

The contest was conducted in the form of a Public Round Table Debate, which involves a round table discussion featuring arguments and proposals. The main objective of this format is to cultivate communication skills and promote active listening. It encourages a comprehensive approach to addressing the issue at hand, fosters empathy, and motivates the audience to take action on matters that concern them.

The students were divided into ten groups consisting of either six or five members with the composition of the teams being determined through a random selection process, and groups were promptly assigned the first debate topic.

They were granted a half-hour duration to prepare for the first round of debates. The groups with an odd number of members were instructed to advocate and defend the given topic, while the groups with an even number of members were specifically tasked with refuting and countering the provided topic during their preparation period. During the preparation, the groups were provided with specific guidelines to follow. Firstly, they were instructed to explore and examine as many aspects and areas of argumentation related to the issue as possible, ensuring a comprehensive analysis. Secondly, they were encouraged to generate solutions to the problem, formulating resourceful proposals that aimed to inspire a change in attitude and mindset among the audience, while also motivating them to take concrete action.

During the debate, each member was allowed to speak for a duration of two (2) minutes. The speeches were delivered in alternating turns between the members of the two groups. It commenced with a member from group A, who advocated in favor of the topic, speaking first. Subsequently, a member from group B provided a response including counter-arguments. The pattern continued as the second member from group A took the floor, followed by further alternating speeches. The order of speaking was determined by the group members (either in advance or on the spot), aiming to create a natural and seamless discussion rather than a contrived exchange of arguments.

Once the two-minute presentations concluded, a dedicated 10-minute period was allocated for question and answer sessions among the members of both groups, with participation open to all members. The objective was to foster an open and free-flowing discussion characterized by mutual respect and active listening. There were no restrictions on the number of questions that each group could pose. However, if one group monopolized the discussion by transforming it into a monologue, it was regarded unfavorably. It was recommended that each group receive and respond to approximately 2-3 questions, ensuring a balanced and interactive exchange of ideas.

The debate was monitored and scored by a panel of three judges. The chairman of the judges' panel declared, either manually or with the assistance of a timer, the end of the designated time and informed about the transition to the next stage. Following this announcement, each member of the jury completed an individual scoring form, carefully assigning a numerical score to each speaker. It was crucial that each judge provided exactly one mark for each speaker, guaranteeing a fair and precise evaluation.

Following the conclusion of the first round, a brief half-hour break was scheduled. Subsequently, the second round commenced, adhering to the same procedure but with a new topic for debate. In contrast to the first round, the instructions for the second round were reversed. This time, the groups with an even number of members were assigned the role of advocating and defending the given topic, while the groups with an odd number of members were tasked with refuting and countering the provided topic during their preparation period. This reversal in instructions brought a dynamic shift to the debate process, ensuring a diverse and engaging exchange of perspectives.

Upon the completion of the second round, the judges delivered their individual scores for each speaker, culminating in the determination of the final scores. Following the lunch break, the announcement of the final results was made.

The students' rankings were determined based on the following criteria:

- Content (1-20 marks): Evaluation of the relevance to the topic, comprehensive exploration of various dimensions, quality of ideas, diversity, originality, inventiveness, adequacy of supporting evidence, effective listening skills, and quality of questioning during open

dialogue.

- Speaker's presence and enunciation (1-15 points): Assessment of fluency, confidence, eye contact, naturalness, and politeness exhibited by the speaker.
- Structure (1-10 points): Consideration of the clarity of thought, coherence, logical sequence, and smooth transition between ideas presented.
- Teamwork (1-5 points): Evaluation of the level of complementarity among team members, demonstration of mutual respect, and active engagement in listening to one another.

Based on these criteria, the students were ranked according to their performance in each category, contributing to the determination of their final scores.

HISTORY OF CHANGES		
VERSION	PUBLICATION DATE	CHANGE
1.0	01.04.2022	Initial version (new MFF).