



CHILDREN'S GENERAL ASSEMBLY 2021

Evaluation of the workshop proces

By CoC Playful Minds

Contents

Introduction.....	3
Purpose of the evaluation	3
The Children's General Assembly workshop process.....	3
The outline of the workshop process was as follows:.....	4
Applicants and participants.....	5
Evaluation design and methods	5
Formative and summative evaluation.....	6
Methods used.....	6
Data foundation for this evaluation report	7
Children's and facilitators' survey response rate.....	8
Additional data.....	8
Informed consent and anonymity.....	9
1.0 Workshops.....	10
1.1 Satisfaction with workshops	10
1.2 The workshop process.....	13
1.3 The parents role in the workshop process.....	15
2.0 Facilitation.....	16
2.1 Framework for workshops.....	17
2.2 Facilitation of workshops	20
2.3 Organization of workshops.....	22
3.0 Teamwork.....	25
3.1 Participation opportunities.....	25
3.2 Relations	29
3.3 Collaboration and community.....	31
4.0 Topic and learnings.....	33
4.1 Knowledge and learning about the subject/problems.....	33
4.2 Knowledge about CGA and the world	34
4.3 Learning about and developing personal competencies	36

Conclusion 39
Recommendations..... 39
Wishes from the children 40

**Children’s General Assembly 2021
 – Evaluation of the workshop process**

Conducted, written, edited and published by
 CoC Playful Minds

Kløvermarken 35
 7190 Billund
 Denmark

A special thanks to all the participating children, parents and facilitators who, besides a lot of time in online workshops and meetings, spend time on contributing to the evaluation and building knowledge which we are able to share and use in the further development of Children’s General Assembly.
 We also wish to thank the project team and partners behind the Children’s General Assembly, who in different ways contributed to outline the evaluation design, goals and purposes.

Appendix:

#1: Graphs and tables

#2: The Clover

3: Key Performers Indicators

See also separate report from the evaluation on September Summit 2021

The reports and Appendix are available on web

www.cocplayfulminds.org
www.capitalofchildren.com



Introduction

This evaluation report contains the evaluation of the very first Children's General Assembly held in 2021. The evaluation shows the results from the children's point of view and takes some key points from the facilitators' perspectives as well as from the parents' or caregivers' perspectives. The evaluation report reflects the workshop process from April to June 2021.

Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to learn and gain knowledge about the value and impact of the process primarily concerning the children's experiences and learnings, and secondly the facilitators' and parents' perspectives. The evaluation unfolds:

- Experiences and learnings from the workshop process during spring 2021 as well as collaboration and co-creation with and around the children (this report, supplied by graphs and tables in Appendix #1)
- Insights and experiences from using the Clover as a method to get knowledge about the indicators on Co-creation, Ownership, Community (Appendix #2)
- To what extent the goals as key performers indicators (KPI's) of Children's General Assembly have been reached (Appendix #3)
- Experiences and learnings from the September Summit 2021 (separate report)

The overall perspectives and learnings will be used to inform the project team, partners and stakeholders and create awareness of the value and potential impacts of this first edition of the Children's General Assembly. Secondly, this knowledge will function as a base for adjustments and further development of the process to ensure the best process for everyone, the interests of the children, their wellbeing and continuing safeguarding, and the loudness and value of the children's voices.

The Children's General Assembly workshop process

The first Children's General Assembly was held as an online process from April-June 2021, and a physical/online Plenary Assembly as a Summit in September 2021. Before the workshop process in April 2021 could take place, the children applied for participation and as part of this process also chose one out of six different topics which they found the most meaningful for them to work with. 10 groups were formed with approximately 8 children in each and matched with two facilitators. Each group was organized according to age, gender, time zone, nationality, and their chosen topic, to establish both diversity and presumed efficacy within the group and a topic diversity across the groups.

Before the workshops (and to some extent also along) there were safeguarding and information meetings with the parents.

Overall, the process held three phases¹: Phase 1 with online workshops from April-June, Phase 2 with preparations for selected representatives from June-August, and Phase 3 with the handover of the manifesto at the physical, partly online, Summit in September. This evaluation report does not concern phase 2 (which was evaluated through dialog with the representatives along this

¹ Find a more detailed overview of the whole process in the Handbook

phase) nor 3. Evaluation knowledge from Phase 3 – the September Summit – can be found in a separate report on the website <https://capitalofchildren.com/assembly/>.

The outline of the workshop process was as follows:

Workshop 1: Introduction, safeguarding, and collaboration

One-on-one introductory conversations between the children and workshop facilitators. The intention was to meet one another (child, a peer, and one or two facilitators) as well as introduce the project, the process, and the roles of the participants. Facilitators also safeguarded the children by establishing a sense of security and subsequently assessing whether and how the individual child could participate. Some of the criteria were: level of English, ability to participate when scheduled as well as in all workshops; motivation; technical issues relating to the online platform; access to computer and internet, etc.

Homework between workshops 1 & 2: The participants prepared a presentation of themselves at home.

Workshop 2: Exploration of themes and issues

The children met each other in the 10 different groups (approximately 8 in each group) for the first time. They got comfortable with the online format through playful learning, and they established common rules for communication. From the main topic, the groups dived deeper into different sub-issues, and through brainstorming, categorization, and voting, the participants agreed on a more specific subject to work on throughout the following workshops.

Homework between workshops 2 & 3: The participants researched the selected subject within their own context, as well as in a social and global perspective.

Workshop 3: Co-creation of solutions

In each group the children shared their research about the chosen subject with each other. Then they used their collective knowledge to formulate a thesis on how to help solve the issue. This thesis formed the basis for ideation and 'idea fusion' which resulted in a single solution to the issue, chosen through a playful and democratic process. The intention was to investigate and understand the issue in the children's local areas, as well as create a qualified solution.

Homework between workshops 3 & 4: The participants researched the collective solution in relation to their home community and built a prototype of their solution.

Workshop 4: Creation and qualification of prototypes

The different prototypes were presented and discussed in the groups, which further deepened the conversation on how to create solutions for the chosen issue. The children then used the notes from this discussion as a basis for outlining speeches in smaller groups. These speeches were reviewed and merged, and the children who were chosen to represent the groups in workshop 5 were prepared for the task.

Workshop 5: Consolidation of manifesto

A group of ten representatives (1 from each workshop group) consolidated the various solutions, perspectives, and reflections in one joint manifesto. These children were thoroughly

prepared for the journey to Billund as representatives for the groups and for the further process. Each representative was told to pick a peer (to secure safety, social belonging, and diverse voices from the group) to join them as representatives at the Summit in Billund.

Workshop 6: Collaboration, community, and evaluation

Back in the original 10 groups, the representatives shared insights on what a manifesto is and should be in order to qualify their own manifesto. All children discussed and evaluated the specific and joint manifesto to make sure that all solutions and perspectives were represented in the text, to eliminate misunderstandings, and to qualify formulations and central messages. As this could not be finished at once, they agreed upon a further review process and a date for termination.

Finally, the children and facilitators evaluated the workshops, products, their shared community, learnings, personal take-aways, and hope for future impact. The children were also encouraged to make videos, articles, and interviews about the process for social media or the local news.

Applicants and participants

200 children from 33 countries, representing 55 different nationalities applied for participation. 36% of these children came from developing countries.

Out of these 200 applicants, 80 children were chosen for participation. But only 75 children participated throughout (more or less) the whole process. The children represented 28 countries, and 40 nationalities (9 of them held double citizenship). 23% of these children came from developing countries. The children were 10-17 years old and with an almost equal gender representation.

The 19 facilitators were volunteers and facilitated the workshops in pairs. CoC Playful Minds invited the facilitators to knowledge-sharing meetings between the different workshops. Data from the questionnaires and from observations informed the dialogue, and the facilitators compared this with their own experiences and reflections on the workshop. If data or observations indicated problems with e.g., participation, group dynamic, technical issues, etc., this was the time and place to share and decide on adjustments.

Evaluation design and methods

The design evolved in a partnership with inputs from LEGO Foundation, DRIVE Foundation, the International School of Billund, and CoC Playful Minds². This partnership prepared a Facilitation Handbook which described the purpose of Children's General Assembly, the partnership collaboration, the process, the timeline, and how children participated. It also described the evaluation and the intention of the Clover (see Appendix #2). Furthermore, the Handbook explained the topics and the pedagogical values underlying the whole process, and last there was a detailed outline of every workshop and the roles of both children and facilitators.

To include as many different indicators from the different partners as possible, and still come up with something relatively simple, we agreed on an experiment. We created an indicator tool, the

² CoC Playful Minds conducted the evaluation

Clover. The inspiration came from an indicator tool used by the International School of Billund to plan pedagogically on what learning through play looks and feels like³

The Clover⁴ consists of a three-leaf-clover representing: Co-creation; Ownership; Community – indicating the level of co-creation, inclusion, and learning through play. We wanted to invite the participants to elaborate on the indicator tool by adding more signs on how they experienced their participation etc. Could this tool contribute to a more responsive and participatory evaluation method?

The three parameters, Co-creation, Ownership, and Community were chosen as central to the process and engagement of the children in creating strong voices for the children. These parameters were again split up into different signs with 'feels-like-words' and 'looks-like-words', which the children and facilitators could choose from or add to. The feels-like and looks-like differentiation was meant to bring awareness to the participants on both feelings and how they could see these things happening, e.g., how it feels and looks like to be a part of a group, to be listened to, and to be equal (or not).

The children also received a logbook (notebook), in which the Clover was illustrated, and they were asked to write down words or sentences related to how they felt and saw the signs of Co-creation, Community, and Ownership along the process. Both children and facilitators were asked to write in their own words how Co-creation, Ownership, and Community felt and looked like in the questionnaire after each workshop.

The Clover data is represented in Appendix #2 as well as considerations on the experiment and the tool's ability to capture the indicators and signs as experienced from the participants' perspectives.

Formative and summative evaluation

The evaluation consisted of a formative and a summative format:

- The formative purpose was to collect data throughout the workshop series with the children to support the process and adjust continually to ensure the best processes for the children and the facilitators
- The summative purpose was to assess the results of the effort of the workshops, and consequently monitor the general goals of Children's General Assembly

Since the Children's General Assembly 2021 was the first of its kind, we wanted to be thorough in documenting and collecting data from different perspectives, bringing these data into the ongoing planning and knowledge sharing sessions between the workshops. The formative evaluation was vital in ensuring the children's wellbeing, creating the best efforts for equity across a very diverse group, and being aware of equal participation.

Methods used

During the online workshop process, we used mixed methods to triangulate and validate the patterns and findings from the data sources.

³ Find more information here: <https://isbillund.com/academics/pedagogy-of-play/indicators-of-playful-learning/>

⁴ See appendix #1

Methods used:

- Single interviews during safeguarding meetings (workshop 1)
- Surveys (questionnaires after each workshop 2-5) for children and facilitators
- Observations (conducted by an evaluator from CoC Playful Minds) in selected workshop groups
- End-survey (questionnaire) after the last workshop, workshop 6, in June
- Single interviews with selected interviewees, seven children and four parents
- Focus group interview with four facilitators
- Survey as a questionnaire after the Summit for representatives/peers (children) and parents/caregivers (see separate report)

The surveys after each workshop were used on an ongoing basis to see if some children had a bad experience in a workshop. There were, throughout the process, answers that differed from the rest. These were handled along the way, which was also the purpose of the evaluation; to follow the children throughout the workshops to see how their expectations were met, to ensure their motivation and participation, and to see if they felt comfortable.

Observations and interviews were transcribed and categorized due to headlines representing patterns, findings in the data, and to what extent this could supplement data from the questionnaires.

Both questionnaires and observations were used to inform and develop interview guides.

From the interviews with the parents, we have strived to minimize and, in some cases, leave out their perspectives on the children's learnings because of their strong bias as parents. The children's voices are strong on their own, and they are further supported and supplemented by reflections and data from the facilitators and observations. Parents' perspectives on their role as supporters at home before, during, and in between the workshops as well as their role as caregivers, are included in the report.

The end-survey after workshop 6 is the data foundation for the descriptive analysis in the summative evaluation concerning the goals of the whole process.

The data from the Summit survey can function as additional data to this but is represented as an independent evaluation in a separate report.

Data foundation for this evaluation report

The basis for this evaluation report is data collected throughout the workshop process and immediately after. The data consist of both qualitative and quantitative data. After each workshop (W2-W5) both children and facilitators were presented with a survey in the form of a questionnaire⁵. After workshop 6, the children and facilitators were asked to fill out an end-survey. The response rate for these surveys can be seen in the table below.

⁵ Find the questionnaires illustrated in the data appendix

Children's and facilitators' survey response rate

The response rate throughout the surveys varies. The response rate for the first workshop was the highest. The development in the response rate is seen below in the schematic overview.

Participating children all together throughout the whole process: 69⁶

Facilitators all together: 19⁷

The percentage is the maximum answer percentage for each questionnaire. Absolute numbers are shown in parentheses.

	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4	Workshop 5*	End Survey
Children	101.45 % ** (70)	69.57 % (48)	65.22 % (45)	90 % (9)	97.10 % (67)
Facilitators	89.47 % (17***)	52.63 % (10)	36.84 % (7)	100 % (2)	47.37 % (9)

*In workshop 5, only 2 facilitators and 10 children participated since it was a joint workshop with the selected representatives from each group.

**In workshop 2 (the children) there are more answers than there should be. This can be due to 1-2 facilitators having answered the wrong questionnaire because of confusions with the questionnaires in the beginning.

***In workshop 2 (facilitators) 19 answers were registered. 2 of these are from a child and a mother, respectively.

A recommendation for future processes is to reconsider the number of surveys presented to the children and facilitators since it seems to have been overwhelming after each workshop. We have not asked about the surveys in the interviews, and therefore we cannot conclude that the number of surveys was too much, but the response rate nevertheless indicates so.

Additional data

Additional data to complement the surveys are observations done for selected workshops. The purpose of the observations, which were conducted by two evaluators following a few groups, was to get a sense of participation; a sense of the continuity as the process evolved; a sense of possible and multiple problems or obstacles, that could perhaps be overcome; and to inform the facilitators' learnings and preparations for the next workshop along the way. Additionally, the observations informed the interview guide together with the answers in the surveys.

After the workshop series, selected children, facilitators, and parents were invited to an interview. The selection of the informants was based on a wish to represent the children's age, nationality, role as a peer or representative, and group. Seven individual interviews with children were conducted.

The selection of informants also applied to the selection of the facilitators and parents. The facilitators were invited to a focus group interview, with four facilitators represented. Regarding interviews with parents, four parents were invited to individual interviews. These were conducted as the last interviews in the interview series.

⁶ The 69 children were found based on a MASTER-document with 75 children (subtracted by 3, who never showed and 3 who due to lack of consent were not sent the questionnaires)

⁷ Throughout the process there was absence from both children and facilitators. As we do not know the precise numbers, they are not included

The material produced by the children in the workshops is also part of the data basis, e.g., Jamboards to find out which topics and issues the groups have worked with. All this material was used in the process by the participants and is therefore not included as part of the analysis in this report, except the fact that it illustrates a great variety and involvement.

Informed consent and anonymity

Every child and their parent signed an informed consent form concerning the use of data during the process for evaluation and materials published. A few participants did not give their consent to collect and use data. Throughout the process, we asked whether the participants were still confident with their consent as they always had the right to withdraw it. None did.

To ensure that no children or participants are exposed or could be harmed by the evaluation data, we have anonymized all quotations and possible traces of personally identifiable data.

1.0 Workshops

How the participating children, their parents, and the facilitators have experienced the individual workshops and the overall workshop series, is a central focus in the evaluation of the Children's General Assembly. The following section highlights central results from evaluation data which contribute with perspectives on workshops.

1.1 Satisfaction with workshops

After each workshop, the children were asked about their experience of participating in the specific workshop. This is also supplemented in the end survey with a question about the overall workshop process. The results from these questions are displayed in the table below:

Q1 – How was it to participate in today's workshop? (Children)

	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4	Workshop 5	End Survey*
	57.14 %	45.83 %	55.56 %	77.78 %	74.63 %
	42.86 %	45.83 %	35.56 %	22.22 %	20.90 %
	0 %	6.25 %	6.67 %	0 %	2.99 %
	0 %	2.08 %	2.22 %	0 %	1.49 %
	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %

*In the end survey, the question was, "How has your experience with the process been overall?"

As is evident in the table above, 74.63% of the children answered with a 'very happy' smiley and 20.90% a 'happy' smiley in the end survey when asked about their experience with the overall workshop process. All in all, 95.55% of the children have been satisfied with the overall workshop process. This is supported, in part, by the facilitators' overall experience of how it has been to facilitate the workshops at the Children's General Assembly (see table below for Q2). Here, 66.67% of the facilitators answered with a 'very happy' smiley and 22.22% answered with a 'happy' smiley in the end survey. All in all, 88.89% of the facilitators were collectively satisfied with the workshop process. So, their rating is a bit lower than the children's overall rating.

Generally, the picture of each workshop shows a high percentage of satisfaction from the children where the answers range between 90% and 100% when 'very happy' smiley and 'happy' smiley are combined (see table above for Q1). In terms of the individual workshops, it shows that workshops 2 and 5 score the highest satisfaction with respectively 57.14% and 77.78% of the answers being 'very happy' smiley. Workshops 3 and 4 are the two workshops where some of the children answered 'neither nor' or 'grumpy' smiley in terms of satisfaction. Additionally, workshop 3 is also the workshop that scores the lowest satisfaction in the percentage of children that answer 'very happy' smiley (45.83%). This is also indicated in the facilitators' answers about their experience of facilitating that day's workshop (see table below), where workshop 3 is the one that scores the lowest satisfaction with only 20% answering 'very happy' smiley and 30% answering with the 'neither nor' smiley. Thus, these results support the notion that workshop 3 was not as successful as the other workshops. However, it is worth noticing that for the facilitators, it was workshops 4 and 5 that had the highest satisfaction with respectively 71.43% and 100%

answering with 'very happy' smiley (do notice that workshop 5 was facilitated by 2 facilitators and was solely for the children who had been chosen as representatives).

Q2 – How was it to facilitate today's workshop? (Facilitators)

	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4	Workshop 5	End Survey*
	58.82 %	20 %	71.43 %	100 %	66.67 %
	41.18 %	50 %	28.57 %	0 %	22.22 %
	0 %	30 %	0 %	0 %	11.11 %
	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %

*In the end survey, the question was as follows, "Q4.1 – How has it been to facilitate in Children's General Assembly overall?"

In the questionnaires after each workshop, the facilitators were also asked what words they would use to describe their experience of that day's workshop (see table for Q13 in the appendix). The results from these answers show that overall, the facilitators had a positive experience of working with the children in the workshops. For workshop 2, the facilitators felt that the best part of the workshop was the children. They mention the skills of the children, their engagement, and their ability to communicate as highlights. Overall, the facilitators describe their experience in the workshop with the words: fun, interesting, difficult, and exciting. For workshop 3, the facilitators describe their experience with the words: interesting, difficult, and surprising. For workshop 4, the facilitators describe the workshop as fun, interesting, exciting, engaging, and creative. For workshop 5 the two facilitators both experienced the workshop as: interesting and exciting. They had a good experience with the workshop, especially the presentation of the speeches. In general, it can be concluded that it has been a positive experience for the facilitators to participate in the workshops.

The satisfaction with the individual workshops is also supported by the children's answers to whether they had fun at the workshop that day (see table below for Q14) and whether they were excited for the next workshop (see table below for Q15).

The answers to Q14 generally indicate that the children had fun at the workshops with answers between 89% and 100% when the 'very happy' and 'happy' smiley answers are combined. This is also supported by the quote below from an interview with a parent, that describes her daughter's experience with participating in the workshops:

The experience that she got from speaking with children and interacting with children from different parts of the world - I don't think there is any other platform where she would have gotten such an incredible experience to not just share her view, but hear it from other children from all over the world and in every session that she had, she came back upstairs after her session with like a big smile even after a four-hour long session, which is long. (interview with parent)

In this quote, the parent describes how she experienced joy on behalf of her daughter as the community and the interaction that the workshops in the Children's General Assembly provided

the settings for, was a highlight and a unique opportunity that is nowhere else to be found. Consequently, this quote supports the general experience of the workshops in the Children's General Assembly.

In the specific results for the individual workshops, it was workshops 2 and 5 where most answered with a 'very happy' smiley. Workshops 3 and 4 were the workshops where the least answered with a 'very happy' smiley to the question on whether today's workshop was fun. Moreover, workshops 3 and 4 were also the workshops where most of the children answered with a 'neither nor' or a 'very grumpy' smiley. Additionally, it is worth noticing that workshop 4 was the workshop that has the lowest answer percentage (89.19%) in the category 'very happy' and 'happy' smileys.

This is also indicated in the answers to Q15 when looking at the children's excitement for the next workshop, which decreased slightly in the percentage of children that answered 'very happy' for each workshop. It is worth noticing that especially after workshops 3 and 4, most children answered 'very happy' or 'happy' smileys.

Q14 - Did you have fun in today's workshop?

	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4*	Workshop 5
	66.07 %	56.25 %	56.76%	71.43 %
	32.14 %	39.58 %	32.43 %	28.57 %
	1.79 %	4.17 %	8.11 %	0 %
	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
	0 %	0 %	2.70 %	0 %

*In Workshop 4, the response options were 1-5 instead of smileys

Q15 - Are you looking forward to the next workshop?

	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4	Workshop 5
	75 %	66.67 %	64.86 %	85.71 %
	21.43 %	27.08 %	32.43 %	14.29 %
	3.57 %	6.25 %	0 %	0 %
	0 %	0 %	2.70 %	0 %
	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %

Based on the results above, it can be concluded that the children were generally satisfied with the workshops and the process. However, it is worth noticing that especially workshops 3 and 4 also score lower ratings. This indicates that the children's experience with, especially workshop 3 and to some extent workshop 4, was not as positive as with the other workshops. These results partially support the facilitators' experience of the individual workshops. Based on these results, workshops 3 and 4 should be focal points in the future planning of the workshop process for the future Children's General Assembly.

1.2 The workshop process

In the end survey, the children were asked more in-depth about their general experience of the workshop process. This section presents the results from the answers to these questions obtained in questionnaires and interviews with both the children and facilitators.

It is evident in the data from Q2.1 (see table below for Q2.1) that 58.06% of the children answered 'very happy' smiley and 35.48% answered 'happy' smiley when asked if there was a connection between the workshops. Collectively that is 93.54% of the children who experienced that there was a connection between the workshops. When looking at the facilitators, 100% answered that they 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' that they experienced a connection between the workshops (see table for Q4.3 in the appendix). Thus, it can be concluded that both the facilitators and the children were happy with the connection between the different workshops.

Q2.1 – There was a good connection between the different workshops

	End Survey
	58.06 %
	35.48 %
	6.45 %
	0 %
	0 %

After applying to become a participant in the Children's General Assembly, the first meeting the parents and caretakers had with the program was a congratulatory letter with information on which group the child or young person was selected to be a part of, what topic the group would be working with, and a description of and dates for the digital workshop series.

In April, the children were invited to safeguarding meetings. The purpose of the meetings was to make sure that the children and young people felt safe and secure. The aim was to share knowledge about the process and for the participants to meet facilitators and be paired up with a peer to ensure an opportunity to build relationships as a part of the overall safeguarding purpose. At these meetings, the participants were told that they could bring their parents – most children did not bring their parents. Data from the end survey show that 90.17% of the children answered that they 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' that they felt well prepared for the workshops after the safeguarding meetings (see table for Q3.2 in the appendix). One of the participating children elaborated in an interview:

I didn't really know exactly what I was getting into. The safeguarding meeting did give me an idea what we were going to do for the final product, that we were going to make the manifesto, but I didn't really know how we were going to get there. But I think the first meeting after the safeguarding meeting gave me an answer to the questions, I think I had. The facilitators told us what we were going to do for the next couple of weeks. So, the safeguard meeting wasn't as detailed as it could have been. (Interview with child)

From the quote above it becomes evident that she did not necessarily feel completely prepared for the process after the first safeguarding meeting, however the safeguarding meeting did give her some idea of the process and answered some of her questions. All in all we can conclude that the children in general felt prepared for the workshops after the preparatory safeguarding meeting before the workshop series. This indicates, that safeguarding meetings are vital.

The purpose of the whole workshop process was that the children in each group should work towards the goal of producing a speech as a contribution to a shared manifesto across all the different groups' contributions to the process. In the end survey, the children were asked whether they were satisfied with their group's speech (see table for Q2.7 in the appendix) and whether they could recognize their group's contribution in the manifesto (see table for Q5.3 in the appendix). To these questions, 98.36% of the children answered, 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' that they were satisfied with their group's speech, and 90.17% of the children answered, 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' that they could recognize their solution in the manifesto. Therefore, it must be presumed that an acceptable percentage of the children were satisfied with and were able to recognize their work in the workshop process. One of the participating children also highlighted the manifesto as a key learning experience he gained from the workshop process:

I learned a bunch. I learned about how a manifesto is supposed to work. I have seen manifestos before, but I didn't really know how one should work or how it is written. I also learned a bunch of stuff about mental health and statistics, and stuff which I didn't really expect to learn. Everyone offered different perspectives, and that allowed for me to sort of have a broader view. (Interview with child)

A quote from another participating child however shows that the process of producing the speech and manifesto itself had been a bit confusing:

I was a little confused about how we were going to make the speech exactly, if it was going to be all of us or just... and I think it was a good idea to appoint one person, and I liked how this one person would talk to everyone in our group, and we would all put insights into the speech, so that all the ideas got into the speech. Even after the speech was done and the manifesto was almost done, they would show us the speech and ask us to add more ideas or think about if something was wrong. (Interview with child)

However, the quote above also shows that the method on which the process was built, where all groups had the opportunity to give feedback on both the speech and the manifesto, worked well.

The individual groups' speeches as well as the manifesto have worked as a way for the children's perspectives to be heard throughout the workshop process. In the end survey, the children were asked whether they believed that the work they had done in the workshops would contribute to letting the children's voices be heard. Here, 91.80% collectively answered 'extremely likely/somewhat likely' to the question (see table for Q5.2 in the appendix). This result indicates that Children's General Assembly has succeeded in letting let the children's voices be heard through the workshop process.

As a part of the collective workshop process, the children were asked to do homework assignments between the individual workshops. In an interview, the facilitators told that they had

mixed experiences with the children's engagement and prerequisites for doing these homework assignments. Some stated that they had written emails about what the children were required to do. However, not all children had done the homework when they attended the next workshop. This was, in facilitators' opinions, caused by some children taking a more relaxed approach which in turn created an imbalance between the children because some had prepared themselves, while others had not. The facilitators stated that this had an impact on the process as there was a difference in the amount of trouble the children had gone to, to prepare. This consequently created unequal opportunities for participation. However, other facilitators also experienced that the children were good at doing their homework assignments – even though they did not have the same prerequisites for completing the assignments, in the individual groups. In the quote below, one of the facilitators states:

I had a different experience. They were all really good at doing their assignments. Even though they did not all have the same prerequisites, they did it as best they could. It was a strength that you could do it in many different ways. (Interview with facilitator)

Thus, the above perspective shows that there were good experiences but also challenges related to the preparation of the homework assignments for the children in the workshop process. Based on this, it is a recommendation that this should be a focal point in the planning of the workshop process for the future Children's General Assembly.

Based on the results above concerning the workshop process, it can be concluded that the workshop process and the output of said process were satisfactory. The children experienced a connection, preparation, and meaningfulness in the work they did in the workshops which resulted in satisfaction with a speech and manifesto that reflects all groups' contributions and perspectives. Therefore, it is recommended that working with supporting, guiding, and creating a connection in the workshop process at Children's General Assembly, is continued.

1.3 The parents role in the workshop process

In the evaluation of the Children's General Assembly, it is evident that the parents' role had an impact on the children's engagement in workshops. The following section presents perspectives from the parents that elaborate further on this role.

From the very beginning of the program, the parents and caretakers were invited to join an introductory meeting. At the meeting, the parents and caretakers were introduced to the purpose of Children's General Assembly, the partnership behind it, the process, and their expected role as caretakers and supporters of the children in the process. Interviews with some of the involved parents/caretakers also show how they, through the workshop process, played the supervising and supportive role for the children. The parents generally did not feel that they needed to do a lot as the children were kept well informed throughout the process. What the parents did do, amongst other things, was support the children by for instance reminding them about the time for the individual workshops and passing on information.

Another way the parents supported their children was to be a part of a feedback process regarding the manifesto. A parent explains this in the following quote:

You should share what you think could be changed because that's the whole point of this discussion, you know, and you don't have to agree with everybody. That's the whole point. That's

what discussions about. Listening to different perspectives, different points of views. That's why you've got a real diverse group of people in this conversation, so people want to hear your voice, you know, share. (Interview with parent)

In the quote above, it is evident that the parents also played a supportive role in giving their children the courage to speak up and voice their opinions in the workshop process. The parents thereby support an important perspective in the process; that the children get to have their perspectives known and feel as if their voices are being heard, also individually.

Another perspective that is central regarding the parents' role is how they acted as a support in motivating their children to participate and how the parents' wish for their child to participate was a motivating factor. In some interviews, the parents talk about where the motivation for attending the assembly comes from. One parent explains how:

This was not something that was pushed on her. She wanted to, really. She believed in it, and she just really wanted to do it. (Interview with parent)

As a part of motivating the children, the parents also played a role in prioritizing the children's participation in workshops. This is by some parents described as a challenge because the children have either experienced that the workshop process was not as expected, or that the individual workshops were scheduled at times where the children also had many other activities. So, from the parents' perspective, the prioritizing of the workshop was not necessarily easy for the children. Therefore, the parents needed to support the children in different ways to help them prioritize the workshops. In this process, some children also took responsibility on their own when concerned with choosing whether they would attend a workshop if they also had another activity that day.

With the parent's perspective above, it becomes clear how such a development for the children does not just happen as they still need support from their surroundings like e.g., the parents. From the parents' perspective and experience, it seems like their role as supporters in different aspects was important for the children to attend the workshop series. The parents took on a role that was not necessarily designed or thought designated for them to begin with but was important, relevant, and a part of the children's process.

Based on this knowledge, it is, therefore, a clear recommendation to recognize that the children's participation in the workshop process is also determined by what is going on at home and the possible support they get from their parents. Thus, this should be an explicit focal point in future planning of the workshop process at Children's General Assembly.

2.0 Facilitation

The facilitation of the workshop series took a lot of effort in the entire project. It included the recruitment of volunteers to facilitate, preparing them via training, and sharing knowledge along the way. The preparation of the handbook with scripts for each workshop and methods to promote flow, meaningfulness, and the children's opportunities for participation in each workshop, was the entire foundation for the process. How the participating children and facilitators experienced the framework and facilitation of the digital workshops are therefore

important focal points in the evaluation of the Children's General Assembly. The following section emphasizes central results from the evaluation data which contributes with perspectives on this.

2.1 Framework for workshops

The framework for the workshops in Children's General Assembly is based on the co-creational approach which was the foundation for the facilitation of the digital workshops. The facilitators were as preparation introduced to the theoretical foundation for and the practical part of co-creation. It was amongst other things through a handbook, facilitator training, as well as ongoing knowledge sharing meetings.

In the end survey, the facilitators answered questions regarding their opinions on whether they felt prepared to facilitate the workshops. The table below shows that 75% of the facilitators answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' that the facilitator training prepared them for the workshops. 87.5% answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' that the knowledge sharing meetings were meaningful. 77.77% answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' that the handbook, amongst other things, supported the process and that they had the necessary knowledge about how to facilitate a co-creation process online and with children.

Q3.1 - Rate the following statements

The percentage is the collective percentage of facilitators who answered, 'Strongly agree' or 'Somewhat agree'

	End Survey
The Facilitation Training before the workshops prepared me well	75 %
The knowledge sharing meetings have been meaningful*	87.5 %
The materials (e.g., scripts for workshops, methods and The Facilitation Handbook) have supported the facilitation of the workshops	77.77 %
I had the necessary knowledge on how to co-create online	77.77 %
I had the necessary knowledge on how to facilitate a co-creation process with children	77.77 %
I had the necessary knowledge on how to use Microsoft Teams	66.66 %

*Answering the questionnaire was voluntary, which is why there is such a big dispersion in the participation.

This is further shown in interviews with the facilitators where the facilitators expressed how the handbook was a good resource in knowing what each workshop contained. They had a lot of

questions, though, because the content was fluffy and not as concrete. Throughout the workshop series, the facilitators came around this by making the workshops their own – but this takes some experience in facilitating, which some facilitators did not have. Before the workshop series took off, the facilitators had a training course. In that regard, the facilitators mentioned how they would have liked more time to go through the first workshop. The training course helped with a good insight into the concept, but the facilitators could have benefited from a more concrete review of the first workshop. This way the facilitators could have experienced on their own how the workshop should proceed and get a feeling for how they could make the workshops their own and work with the methods. Another way to be more prepared for the workshops was to go through the workshop with their co-facilitator in advance. The facilitators found ways to be more prepared, but they also suggest how the preparation could have been facilitated by the team behind the training course.

Moreover, the facilitators have been asked more in-depth in the questionnaire about how many hours they used per week on the project. Additionally, the topic of volunteering was brought up in the focus group interview that was done with selected facilitators. The time the facilitators spent can be seen in the table below.

4-6 hours per week	6-8 hours per week	8-10 hours or more per week
50 %	37.5 %	12.5 %

In the focus group interview, the facilitators mentioned that the time they spent on the project was all right. But they also mentioned that there was a lot of work in the project, given it was only voluntary. The facilitators also mentioned how they would have liked to know earlier which days the workshops would take place as well as a social activity before the start of the workshop series. The facilitators needed to plan their time of engagement because the workshops were held on weekends and all other activities also took place in their sparetime.

The results above hence indicate that the facilitators felt partially prepared and well-equipped to facilitate the workshops but also that preparation might be improved in the coming Children's General Assembly. Based on these results, it is, therefore, a recommendation to have an increased focus on the training of and preparation for the facilitators. Additionally, it is relevant to consider how much time it is expected that the facilitators use on the project to be able to align expectations and thus ensure that the necessary time is invested in preparation for the workshops.

In the evaluation data, we also find a series of central takeaways for both the children and facilitators that have been achieved due to the framework that was set for the workshops.

In interviews, the facilitators talk about this, that they throughout the workshop series have gained hands-on experience with the co-creational approach. This way the facilitators noticed what opportunities co-creation with children held, and they were impressed by the approach. They experienced it as a good way to include the children's perspectives and noticed how it worked in a digital format and that the digital format did not seem like an obstacle for co-creation. Additionally, the facilitators described that the biggest return from the process was the meeting with the children: getting to experience them and their work effort, listening to them, becoming better at English, getting new hope for the future after having met the children, developing facilitation competencies as well as learning new tools/methods.

In the questionnaire, the facilitators were also asked to elaborate on why they had chosen to be a part of Children's General Assembly. Here, most answered one of the following things: they think it is a good project and therefore wish to back up the project; they see it as an opportunity to gain experience and personal growth; or they like working with children. For most of them, it has exceeded their expectations to be a part of the project and it has generally been a positive experience (questionnaire). Based on these results it can be concluded that the facilitators had an overall good experience facilitating the workshops.

Another perspective that becomes clear from the data is that the children experienced a large degree of trust and safety through the workshop process (see table below for Q4). Between 90-100% of the children answered for each workshop that they either 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' that they had faith in the process and felt safe in the group. Additionally, 90-100% of the children also answered that they 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' that they had understood the purpose of the day's workshop.

Q4 - Facilitation

The percentage is the collective percentage of participants who answered, 'Strongly agree' or 'Somewhat agree'

	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4	Workshop 5
I understood the purpose of today's workshop	100 %	91.67 %	100 %	100 %
Working in breakout rooms worked well	89.23 %	87.5 %	89.48 %	100 %
We had enough time to work with our project	93.85 %	85.42 %	89.47 %	85.72 %
The workshop was varied (for example between different methods, group work, dialog and discussions)	92.31 %	85.42 %	92.11 %	100 %
Time went fast	75.38 %	68.75 %	76.32 %	85.72 %
It was easy to participate and have a say	93.85 %	93.75 %	92.10 %	85.72 %
I have trust in the process	96.92 %	91.67 %	97.37 %	100 %
I feel safe in the group	93.85 %	97.92 %	97.37 %	100 %

This is also evident in the interviews with the children. Here one of the girls talked about how the group had felt like a safe place, where they were able to have discussions (interview). Moreover, one of the participating boys pointed out the following about the workshops:

But it has sort of opened my mind more and allowed me to trust the process.
(Interview with child)

The quote above shows how the trust in the process is also emphasized as a central takeaway for this boy, which is consistent with the general opinion of the workshops in the group of children.

The results above thus indicate that the framework for the workshops through the co-creational approach created a foundation for a lot of positive takeaways from the process. Additionally, the results show that even though the facilitators did not feel adequately equipped they were able to frame the individual workshops to such a degree that the children felt that there was good trust and safety through the facilitation of the workshops. This supports the importance of ensuring that there throughout the process is offered guidance and supervision of the facilitators to best equip them for the individual workshops.

2.2 Facilitation of workshops

The following section presents multiple central elements in the evaluation of the facilitation of the workshops in the Children's General Assembly. This is based on results from the data where both the children's and facilitators' perspectives from the questionnaire and interviews are featured.

The facilitation in Children's General Assembly is first and foremost carried out based on a series of methods that support the co-creational approach. In the co-creational approach, it is a central element that everyone has the same opportunity for participation. In the questionnaire, the children were asked about their experience with the facilitation of the workshops, and it is evident from the answers to question Q4, that for workshops 2, 3, and 4, 92-93% of the children answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' that it was easy to participate and say something in the individual workshops. For workshop 5, this number is a bit lower, with 85,72% who answered, 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree', which can be because the purpose of this workshop was that the chosen representatives from each group should perform their group's contribution consisting of a speech. Based on these results, it can overall be concluded that the children's opportunity to participate in the individual workshops was satisfactory.

This is also supported by the facilitators' experience of the different methods that they have presented and have used in the workshops. In interviews, they talked about how they experienced that the methods, they had been using in the workshops, could be used in different settings. The facilitators explained how the methods differed from each other and had throughout the workshops experienced how the methods could enable e.g., creativity, dialog, and reflection, and support both social and professional interaction. The facilitators also mentioned that it is a good idea to be aware of the age range concerning the methods, because some methods, for example, drawing, worked better with the younger children. Lastly, they mentioned that the methods enable dialog and allow everybody to have an opportunity to have a say (interview). These results indicate that the methods have supported the co-creational facilitation of the workshops.

In addition to the methods, time and time spent have also been a central aspect of the workshop. In the questionnaires, the children were asked whether there was enough time to work on the project for the workshop (see table above for Q4). Here the answers are divided as follows: Workshops 2 and 4 are the workshops where most children answered, 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree', whereas workshops 3 and 5 are the ones where the fewest agreed that there

was enough time. Thus, these results indicate that the children experienced that there, especially in workshops 3 and 5, were not enough time.

When the facilitators were asked whether they thought that the children were able to solve the assignments within the given time limit, the answers were divided in the following way:

	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4	Workshop 5
The children were able to solve the problem or task within the given time	88.24 %	70 %	85.72 %	50 %

In the answers above it is evident that the percentage of the facilitators that answered, 'strongly agree' and 'somewhat agree' to the question of whether there was enough time, generally is lower than the percentage for the children. One of the explanations could be that the facilitators had a better overview of what was expected of them to go through in each workshop.

This is also emphasized by the facilitators when they talked about time and time spent in the interviews. They explained that the methods can be complex and at times difficult to understand. Additionally, they experienced that it was difficult to ensure that there was enough time to go through the entire program in the individual workshops. This in turn led to some of them using the children's time after the workshops ended because there was not enough time allotted. This was especially due to the complexity of the program but also because they experienced that there was not enough time allotted to engage in dialog with the children. Furthermore, sometimes they experienced the workshops as a race to get through all the methods, and the facilitator team felt they had to choose between methods to get through the workshop in time. At times there was a need to simplify the planned program because it took more time than expected to frame an activity. It was a balance between the method and the explanation not taking more time than the actual process. The quote below from an interview with the facilitators illustrate this:

I simplified the program a little because it also takes time to set the framework for an exercise when the children must do it. The method and explanation cannot take up more time than the process itself. (Interview with facilitator)

Another central perspective regarding time has been about the children's understanding of when the individual workshops were and in what time zones. Some children expressed how they were challenged by the time zones and the time of the workshops. One mentioned the time difference as the most difficult thing and elaborated on how she one time misunderstood when the workshop started and ended up being late. It was difficult for her to see what times she was available because she had to use a time converter:

I think for the first meeting, I was... I thought it was at one time, but it was actually earlier my time. So, I was a little late and it was hard to kind of like... see what times I was available because I had to use like a time converter. (Interview with child)

One boy supported this and expressed how he was also challenged by the organization of the workshops, meaning keeping track of the time and date for the different workshops.

The results above indicate that the facilitation of the workshops through the co-creational methods has been meaningful and created opportunities for participation. The results also show that there generally in the workshops have been too little time to work concentrated with the methods and still complete the program for the individual workshops, as the program has been complex and had a too tight schedule. Moreover, for some of the children, there was also a problem with understanding at what time the individual workshops were scheduled. Thus, a recommendation is that the content of the individual workshops be reconsidered to ensure that there is a better connection between time and purpose. Furthermore, a clear line of communication about what time and time zone the individual workshops are in should be established.

2.3 Organization of workshops

The organization of workshops in the Children's General Assembly were carried out as online workshops with a duration of approximately 4 hours. The program was established beforehand based on the handbook with descriptions of the agenda and purpose of each workshop. The focus of the organization of the workshops had a starting point in the pedagogical principles for learning through play and co-creation. The following section is focused on the results of the evaluation regarding and contributing with perspectives on the experiences with the organization of the workshops.

In the questionnaire, the children were asked about their experiences with variation in the workshops. Here it is shown in the table above for Q4 that between 85-100% answered, 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' that they felt that the workshops were varied and alternated between for instance different methods, group work, dialog, etc. Moreover, the children were asked whether time went by fast at the individual workshops. For this question, only 68-86% answered that they 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree'. These results suggest that even though the children experienced variation in the program at the workshops, some of them did not feel as if time flew by fast. Possible reasons for this are explained in interviews with the children where they highlighted 'virtual burnout' as a central problem during the workshops. When asked about the challenges, the children met during the process, they mentioned the online format. For instance, some children mentioned the long hours in front of the computer screen as a challenge:

Uh, the most difficult definitely would be - not that I didn't enjoy that to say like 4 hours, but it was because, I mean, I would do even more like 5 hours - but it was sometimes ... I got a little bit tired, not annoyed. Just tired, so it was ... it was a long time being online, and it is also like technical problems... (Interview with child)

The participant described how the online format challenged her with both 'virtual burnout' and technical issues. Another participant agreed with her and talked about how he is a person who really suffers sitting a lot in front of screens:

The fact it was four hours continuously was a bit disturbing. So if I were to improve, I would make two meetings of two hours instead of one of four. (Interview with child)

The quotes above from some of the children further stress that even though the program varied in the individual workshops, the online format played a role in determining how long they were able to concentrate. This is further supported by observations⁸ from the workshops where it appeared that the online format for the workshops created possibilities but also set some natural boundaries. These consist of, amongst other things, an increased focus on clear communication as well as mastering how to keep the children's attention. This has also been a focus in the planning of the workshops. Virtual burnout is an issue that needs attention since experiences show that virtual workshops can trigger tiredness and the participants can feel challenged to stay focused. Keeping the workshops balanced between games, using online resources like Jamboards, introducing Lego from the workshop kit, and shifting with breakout rooms has been a priority. Nevertheless, in the evaluation, the children talked about how they, despite the dynamics in the workshops, became tired and felt that 4 hours was a long time being in a virtual workshop.

Thus, the playful elements have, amongst other things, acted as an instrument to ensure variety in the workshops. In the questionnaires, both the children and facilitators were asked about their experience with the degree of play. For the children, the answers are divided as follows:

Q3.1 - How satisfied are you with the level of play and fun during the process?

	End Survey
	54.10 %
	40.98
	3.28 %
	1.64 %
	0 %

The results above show that the children collectively have a satisfaction rate of 95.08% concerning the degree of play in the workshops, which must be considered satisfactory.

The facilitators were also asked whether the children enjoyed the games in each workshop. In this case, 50-87% stated that they 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' to this question. Furthermore, with regards to this question, the level of agreement decreases for each workshop (see table for Q11 in the appendix). These results might indicate that the degree of the playful elements could possibly have taken up more space to create more variation in the program. At the same time, the facilitators' answers indicate that there might be a need for the facilitators to gain a better understanding of how the playful element is to be understood and interpreted in co-creation.

Based on these results it can be concluded that even though there was a focus on keeping the children interested and creating variation in the online workshops, it was not completely successful. Therefore, it is recommended that in the future there is an increased focus on 'virtual burnout'. Thus, it is important to prioritize a more dynamic program for the individual workshops and additionally, it should be considered whether it is possible to organize the workshops

⁸ From the observations it is evident that using breaks varies a lot and that breaks are sometimes skipped or very short to ensure that the workshop program is covered within the set timeframe.

differently to possibly shorten the length of the workshops. Moreover, it can be an advantage to put additional focus on how the playful elements should be maintained as an even more integrated part of each workshop throughout the process.

A central part of the organization of the workshops in the Children's General Assembly has also been the technical resources that have supported facilitation in the digital format of the workshops. From the evaluation results for both children and facilitators, it is evident that this is a central element in the facilitation of the workshops. Before the workshop series, the children were sent a workshop kit with e.g., a welcome letter, a notebook, and a LEGO building set. In the workshops, the facilitation had been set up around online resources such as Jamboard and the use of breakout rooms in MS Teams. In the following section, it is addressed how both the children and the facilitators experienced these resources.

The workshops were held online via MS Teams and facilitated with the use of breakout rooms. Breakout rooms were used to create small groups, where the children could reflect and discuss different perspectives with each other. In the questionnaire, the children were asked whether working in break-out rooms in Teams worked well. To this, between 87-100% of the children answered that they 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' with this at each workshop (see table above for Q4). One of the participating children elaborated on this in an interview:

I also really enjoyed breakout rooms, which, like I got to know, like individuals better and just chat and like, uhm, just hear different point of views in general and yeah, so in breakout rooms. (Interview with child)

From the quote above, break-out rooms are viewed as a good resource in the digital format of the workshops as this has created an opportunity for an increased formation of relationships between the children. In their evaluation, the facilitators have also paid attention to the use of break-out rooms. Here they talked about their experiences in which they found that the children worked best in the break-out rooms and that it worked well. However, some stated that they had trouble with the break-out rooms and that it technically did not always work for all the children participating in the workshop. Generally, multiple of the facilitators also mentioned that they experienced technical challenges and issues with amongst other things, lacking internet connections and access to MS Teams (interview). From the questionnaire, it is also evident that only 66.66% of the facilitators agreed that they had the necessary knowledge on how to use MS Teams (see table for Q3.1 in the appendix). The technical issues manifested themselves amongst other things by the fact that the chat did not always work for everybody. This presented itself as a challenge for the facilitators as they, therefore, were not able to send links to Jamboards to the children amongst other things (interview).

Jamboard (software program) was used as a digital Knowledge Wall. It helped the children see each other's perspectives and remember what they had talked about in the last workshop. Jamboard was used as a tool for the children to make post-its that they could move around and thereby actively participate in the different phases of the co-creation process such as idea generation and grouping of ideas. One of the participating children elaborates on the use of Jamboard in the quote below:

You can definitely see in like ... 'cause we have a jamboard of which shows our whole progression over the project and I think you can definitely see all of our ideas in there. You can definitely see a little bit of all of us in there. (Interview with child)

Thus, Jamboard as a resource in online workshops also worked as a good tool for the facilitation of the co-creational practice. The facilitators also experienced that Jamboard was indeed a good resource but the challenge of using this tool was that it made it harder to see each other on the screen.

From the results above it can be concluded that both children and facilitators experienced that the technical resources used in online workshops have both created unique opportunities and challenges in connection to the facilitation. The technical challenges can, amongst other things, have had a consequence for the facilitators' opportunity to complete the program and may impact the children's participation. Based on this, a recommendation for the future is to be aware of what resources are used in workshops and whether they work as intended. Based on the positive results with these tools, it is also recommended to keep using some of these resources as online facilitation tools that can support co-creational processes in workshops.

3.0 Teamwork

In the evaluation of the Children's General Assembly, a focal point has been both the children's and facilitators' experience of teamwork, especially between the children. The following section emphasizes central results from the evaluation data that contribute with perspectives on this.

3.1 Participation opportunities

A central aspect of the evaluation of teamwork between the children has been the children's opportunities for participation and their opportunities to share perspectives and ideas with each other. The following section presents the results from the evaluation that illustrate this aspect.

The Q3 table shows how the children have been asked a string of questions concerning teamwork:

Q3 - Teamwork

The percentage is the collective percentage of participants who answered, 'Strongly agree' or 'Somewhat agree'

	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4	Workshop 5	End Survey
I said and did the things, I wanted in today's workshop	90.77 %	85.42 %	89,75 %	87,5 %	98.39 % *
I learned something from my teammates in today's workshop	96.92 %	93.75 %	92.31 %	100 %	<i>The question was not included in the End Survey</i>
It was easy to understand the other in the group (language)	89.23 %	91.67 %	92.31 %	100 %	<i>The question was not included in the End Survey</i>
We used each other's ideas	96.92 %	97.92 %	94.87 %	100 %	95.17 % **

We listened to each other's different perspectives	100 %	97.92 %	94.87 %	100 %	100 % ***
I felt part of a group	96.93 %	91.67 %	89.74 %	100 %	<i>The question was not included in the End Survey</i>
We kept a good tone and spoke proper to each other	98.46 %	100 %	97.44 %	100 %	<i>The question was not included in the End Survey</i>

*In the End Survey the question was as follows, "Q2.3- I said and did the things, I wanted throughout the process"

**In the End Survey the question was as follows, " Q2.4 - We have used each other's ideas"

***In the End Survey the question was as follows, " Q2.5 - We have listened to each other's different perspectives"

From this Q3 table, it is evident that the percentage of children who answered, 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree', to questions about whether they did and said the things they wanted to in that day's workshop, decreases from workshop 2 (90.77%) to workshop 3 (85.42%), and increases again in workshop 4 (89.75%). In the end survey where the children answered this question thinking of the overall process, 98.39% answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree'. Therefore, this must be assumed to be a satisfactory result for the children's participation in the workshop process.

The children's experience of contributing to and participating in teamwork is also expressed when the children were asked whether they have used each other's ideas and listened to each other's perspectives. Here, the results in the table above show that the percentage of children who answered, 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' to using each other's ideas increases from workshop 2 (96.92%) to workshop 3 (97.92) and decreases from workshop 3 to workshop 4 (94.87%). For the overall workshop process, 95.17% of the children answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' to having used each other's ideas in the end survey. Additionally, the percentage of children who answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' to listening to each other's perspectives continuously decreased from workshop 2 (100%) to workshop 3 (97.92%) to workshop 4 (94.87%). In the end survey, 100% answered that they had listened to each other's perspectives in the overall workshop process. Even though these results see a slight decrease throughout the process, it is still an expression of how many of the children experienced having good opportunities for participating in the overall workshop process.

This is also evident in interviews with some of the participating children. Here, a boy says the following about teamwork:

I could both develop that idea, but also develop my own skills which I was trying to improve through this project. You can definitely see in like ... 'cause we have a jamboard of which shows our whole progression over the project and I think you can definitely see all of our ideas in there. You can definitely see a little bit of all of us in there. (Interview with child)

From the quote above, it is evident that the boy felt that they had all contributed with ideas and perspectives that as a collective contributed to the process. This is also evident in other statements from interviews given by the children: A girl emphasizes the importance of sharing something with others, getting perspectives on different themes and cases from other peers

around the world, and getting ideas with others. Another participant agrees with her, as he highlighted meeting new people and listening to their perspectives as one of the rewards of participating. He enjoyed discussing democracy and global issues with peers and hearing their perspectives and ideas. He experienced a group where everybody talked one at a time, listened to each other, did not interrupt each other, and respected one another (interview).

Another central perspective with regards to the children's opportunity to participate, is thereby the communicative part. This is evident when the children were asked about teamwork in the questionnaire (see table above for Q3). Here the percentage of children that answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree', to whether they thought the tone used was kept civil and everyone communicated well with each other, was generally very high and for all workshops lie between 97-100%. Additionally, the children experienced that they understood each other, and the percentage of children who answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' to whether they thought it was easy to understand the others in the group, increases a little throughout the workshop series from 89-100%. The results above thereby indicate that there amongst the children have been respect for people contributing, sharing, and communicating with each other.

The results for the children's participation opportunities above, recur in the data results for the facilitators. Here it is evident from the questionnaire that the percentage of facilitators that answered 'extremely good' or 'somewhat good' about their impression of the group is overall 100%, except for workshop 3 where it is 90% (see table for Q5 in the appendix). The results also show that for all workshops, 100% of the facilitators answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' to whether the children were respectful to each other (see table for Q7 in the appendix). Additionally, between 94-100% of the facilitators answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' to whether the children listened to each other's different perspectives (see table for Q7 in the appendix).

This is also evident in the interviews with the facilitators: The facilitators were in general impressed with the children's effort. They experienced that the children were good at communicating, were committed, and respected each other. The facilitators also experienced the composition of the groups as good; the number of children in each group worked well, as well as the age span, and it invited a dynamic and energetic atmosphere with a flow (interview). Furthermore, in the end survey, 88.89% of the facilitators indicate that they agree that the overall connection between the children in the groups was good (see table for Q4.4 in the appendix). Thus, it can be concluded that the facilitators, same as the children, experienced good teamwork between the children. Good teamwork is characterized by respect for including and listening to each other's perspectives.

In the questionnaire, the facilitators were also explicitly asked to relate to their experience of the children's equal opportunity for participation. The results of the questions are shown in the table below:

Q9 - Choose how much you agree or disagree in the following statements related to your experience of how the children experienced to be a part of a team and participated equally. Equality is about how the participants experience to be able to participate equally.

The percentage is the collective percentage of facilitators who answered, 'Strongly agree' or 'Somewhat agree'

	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4	Workshop 5
The children referred to each other (e.g., each other's ideas or perspectives)	88.24 %	88.89 %	71.43 %	100 %
The children acknowledged and recognized each other by listening or paying attention	100 %	100 %	85.71 %	100 %
The children seemed inspired by each other	94.12 %	80 %	85.72 %	50 %
The children worked well together	94.12 %	90 %	100 %	100 %
The children tried to help each other	94.11 %	90 %	71.43 %	50 %

In this table, it is worth noticing that the percentage that answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' to whether the children refer to each other's ideas decreases from workshop 2 and 3 with approximately 88% to 71% in workshop 4. Additionally, the facilitators are 100% in consensus about this in workshop 5. The reason for the decline throughout the workshops may be because workshop 4 primarily focused on collecting the children's already existing ideas and turning them into a collective solution. This is also evident in the facilitators' answers to whether the children used each other's ideas for further work. From workshop 3 to workshop 4 the percentage decreased from 100% to 85.72% who answered, 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' (see table for Q11 in the appendix). Furthermore, it is evident in the end survey where only 66.67% of the facilitators answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' to whether it was easy to get everyone involved and engaged in workshops (see table for Q4.4 in the appendix). Thus, these results indicate that the degree to which the children participated was challenged and it was especially visible the longer into the workshop process they got.

Moreover, it is also evident from the table above that the percentage that answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' to whether the children recognized each other, and paid attention decreases from 100% in workshops 2 and 3 to 86% in workshop 4. However, workshop 5 also scores 100%. In relation to this, it is also interesting to point out how the percentage who answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' to whether the children tried to help each other continuously decreases from workshop 2 (94%) to workshop 3 (90%), workshop 4 (71%), and workshop 5 (50%). Based on these results it thus can be concluded that for workshops 2-4 the facilitators experienced that the degree of recognition, attention, and help between the children, decreased the longer into the workshop process they get.

To the question about whether the children seemed inspired by each other, it is worth noticing that the percentage who answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' decreases from workshop 2 (94%) to workshops 3 (80%) and increases again in workshop 4 (86%). A similar pattern is seen for the question of whether the children worked well together. Here the percentage who answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' decreases from workshop 2 (94%) to workshop 3 (90%) and increases again in workshop 4 (100%). Thus, these results indicate that workshop 3, as previously mentioned, was challenging and not as successful as the other workshops. This further highlights that this workshop should be a focal point in future planning.

From the results above, it can thus be concluded that the children's opportunities for participation generally were partially satisfactory. This is evident because the children used each other's ideas and listened to each other's perspectives. Furthermore, the communication and understanding between participants worked well which is supported by statements from the interviews with the children and facilitators. However, there was trouble keeping up the children's engagement and participation throughout the process. Based on these results, it is recommended that there in the future is an increased focus on how the children's opportunities for participation can be ensured throughout the entire process.

3.2 Relations

Relations and the formation of relationships between the children were a focus in the evaluation of teamwork in the Children's General Assembly. Therefore, the following section presents results from data that give perspectives on the importance of the relational relationships.

In the end survey, the children were asked to respond to whether they had gotten to know new people through the process. When the children were asked whether they had gotten to know new people, 95.16% of the children answered with a 'very happy' or 'happy' smiley (see table below for Q2.2).

Q2.2 – I have gotten to know new people*

*The question resembles Q6, "Have you talked to your peer(s) or any of the others from your group outside of the workshop?" That question is a yes/no question, while the answers to this question Q2.2, are given in smileys.

	End Survey
	74.19 %
	20.97 %
	3.23 %
	1.61 %
	0 %

To get to know new people and getting good relations among the children are important elements for the children. This is clear from both interviews and surveys where the children highlight the relations with the other participants as a main takeaway from the process and express how they are delighted to have met different people throughout the Children's General Assembly. This is also expressed in observations of the first workshop, where the children talked about their expectations for the process. Here the children mentioned making new friends and getting to know other children from all over the world. In the end survey, this is also highlighted by the children as one of the benefits of the process. In interviews with the facilitators, they also highlighted that they experienced how the children developed friendships across national borders (interview).

In addition to the children having gotten to know new people, they were also asked how well they had gotten to know the other participating children from their group. The table below illustrates the distribution of the children's answers:

Q4.1 - How well did you get to know the others in your group?

	End Survey
A lot	32.79 %
A moderate amount	52.46 %
A little	14.75 %

The table above shows that 32.79% answered 'a lot', 52.46% answered 'a moderate amount', and 15% answered 'a little' when asked how well they have gotten to know the others in their group. Thus, these results indicate that the children, to a certain degree, got to know each other but that it is possible for them to have gotten to know each other even better. This is also seen in the question of whether the children felt that they got to know the others in their group at the individual workshops (see table for Q2 in the appendix). Here, only 57-63% answered 'a great deal' or 'a lot' to this question which indicates that the degree to which there were opportunities to form relations at the individual workshops was not very high.

This is also highlighted as a central focus for the facilitators. They highlighted that they in general would have wanted more time for the children to form relations and socialize with each other. Based on these observations, the facilitators expressed a wish to have a social program together with the children prior to the workshop series, to ensure that there was time to establish social relations beforehand. This is a wish because they experienced how the children wanted to get to know each other and to be social with one another (interview). Thus, the results above indicate that even though the children have gotten to know new people, there could have been more opportunities for socializing with each other in the process.

The desire to create relations with one another is also emphasized by the children's increasing degree of involvement with each other outside the workshop framework:

Q6 - Have you talked to your peer(s) or any of the others from your group outside of the workshop?

	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4	Workshop 5	End Survey*
Yes	31.25 %	35.42 %	50 %	71.43 %	59.02 % **
No	68.75 %	64.58 %	50 %	28.57 %	40.98 % ***

*For the end survey the question was, "Q4.2 - Have you been talking to some of the other participants outside of the workshops?"

**For the end survey the answer categories were, "a lot" and "a little"

***For the end survey the answer category was, "none at all"

The table above shows an increase in the percentage of children who answered 'a lot' or 'a little' to whether they have talked to others from their group outside the workshops. It increases from 31.25% after workshop 2 to 50% after workshop 4, and to 71.45% after workshop 5. In the end survey, 59.02% of the children answered 'a lot' or 'a little' to whether they had talked to other participants outside the workshops.

From the results above, it becomes evident that there is a desire and a need for forming relations and getting to know each other from both the children and facilitators. Based on this, it is recommended that this should be an even more explicit focus in future planning.

3.3 Collaboration and community

From the evaluation results, collaboration and community appear as two central elements in teamwork for the participating children and facilitators. The section below elaborates on this perspective.

In general, the results from the questionnaires show that for each workshop between 70-88% of the children felt that they had learned 'a great deal' or 'a lot' about collaboration (see table for Q2 in the appendix). Additionally, in the end survey, 96.72% of the children answered that they 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' to whether they had learned to collaborate through the process (see table for Q3.4 in the appendix). Furthermore, 96.72% of the children also expressed that the level between work together and alone had been appropriate (see table for Q4.3 in the appendix). This is also expressed in the interviews and the text-entry boxes throughout all the surveys where the children highlighted the community aspect of the Children's General Assembly. A summary of the results of the surveys after each workshop shows how the children predominantly experienced that the collaboration worked well and that they listened to each other. In interviews, the children also voiced their opinion on the collaboration. Here, one of the boys explains how it was easy to learn to cooperate with the other group members:

It was very easy to learn how to cooperate with each other because we just had to learn about cooperation and cooperate while doing it. (Interview with child)

The quote illustrates that he believes that the collaboration worked without fault. Additionally, he adds that because the members of the group had a background in different countries, it affected how their perspectives were also differentiated. He also mentions that the individual assignments throughout the process worked to emphasize the different perspectives. Though the collaboration shows as an important part of the children's experience, it hasn't always been easy collaborating, a participant explains. Another participant describes the collaboration as challenging when they in his group had to find different compromises between different ideas:

All very different people, very different ideas. So, finding solutions based on both those ideas. (Interview with child)

The results above are also supported by data from the questionnaires where the facilitators were asked to respond to the children's collaboration. Here, the percentage that answered 'extremely good' or 'somewhat good' about their experience of the group's collaboration is 94.2% for workshop 2, 90% for workshop 3, 100% for workshops 4 and 5 (see table for Q5 in the appendix). In interviews, this is elaborated on when the facilitators highlighted the children's effort and collaboration, and most of the facilitators expressed how it went well with their group of children and how they experienced the workshop as meaningful for the children (interview).

Based on the results above, it can be presumed that the children had a positive experience collaborating unitedly with each other but that it at times was challenging, which is not necessarily seen as a negative thing.

In the questionnaire, the children were asked whether they felt like a part of the group. Here, the percentage of children who answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' continuously decreases from workshop 2 (96.93%) to workshop 3 (91.67%) and workshop 4 (89.74%). However,

for workshop 5 it is 100% (see table for Q3). A possible reason for this development can be found in interviews with some of the participating children and their parents. Here they expressed that there was some confusion about the selection of representatives and peers. The selection process of the representatives happened partially through a nomination from the facilitators. In connection to the selection process of representatives, the parents and caretakers were informed about the nomination of their child and asked to talk to her/him about motivation, responsibility, and tasks connected to accepting the nomination to be the group representative. During an interview, a girl talked about how she was confused about peers and representatives because she thought the peers were the ones, they connected with at the first safeguarding meeting (interview). A parent expressed how the selection of the representative was not only a bit confusing but also caused some disappointment for her daughter when she wasn't selected as a representative. Both mother and daughter would have liked to get an explanation to why she was not selected, but at the same time saw it as a learning point. She continued, that It would have been easier to explain the selection process as a learning experience if she knew more about the criteria and the whole selection process. Then she would have been able to explain to her daughter what the criteria were, so her daughter would understand. They both wished for more clear communication on this process (interview).

The results above indicate that there was confusion about both the selection of and the roles of, respectively, representatives and peers, as the term peer was used both at the safeguarding meetings and as a peer of a representative. Additionally, this selection process can also be presumed to have had an impact on the children's feeling of being a part of the group as well as their engagement in the last workshop. Based on this, it is recommended that in the future, the communication about the organizing of representatives and peers is clearer.

In the evaluation of the collaboration, the facilitators were also asked about their experience of their collaboration. Here it is evident, from the questionnaire results, that the percentage who answered 'extremely good' or 'somewhat good' to their experience of the collaboration with their co-facilitator was 94% for workshop 2, 70% for workshop 3, and 86% for workshop 4. In the end survey, this answer was 67% (see table for Q5 in the appendix). In the end survey, the facilitators were also asked further about this. Here only 66.67% answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' to whether the collaboration with their co-facilitator and generally if being two people to facilitate had worked (see table for Q4.4 in the appendix).

This focus is elaborated on in interviews with the facilitators. The collaboration between the facilitator and the co-facilitator is not described positively by everyone, but most of the facilitators described the teamwork as well-functioning. Some mentioned how the collaboration with their co-facilitator was the best part of one of the workshops. In an extension to this, one facilitator expressed how she experienced that the teamwork with her co-facilitator did not work well. In the focus group interview with the facilitators, she elaborated on this and told how she had been feeling alone and had missed feeling that it was a shared project between those two, as a facilitator team. Other facilitators explained how they had held meetings with their co-facilitator before the workshop to agree on how to run the workshop. The facilitators enjoyed being two people as a facilitator team, so they could spar with and support each other.

From the results above it can therefore be concluded that it for some facilitators was a good experience to collaborate with another facilitator on doing workshops, where it for other facilitators was not as good an experience. Based on this it is recommended that there is a more

explicit focus on creating better connections and relations between the facilitators to create better collaborations that will act as the basis for the facilitation of the workshops.

4.0 Topic and learnings

In the evaluation of the Children's General Assembly, there was also a specific focus on the possible learning the children obtained through their participation. Data shows how the children's learnings vary between the development of personal skills and knowledge about different issues. There are also differences on *how* the children learned – some learned by listening to others and their perspectives, some highlighted the home research assignment as a learning point (interview). The following section emphasizes central results from the evaluation data that contribute with perspectives on this.

4.1 Knowledge and learning about the subject/problems

First and foremost, results from the evaluation show that the children gained knowledge and learned about their group's topic and the issue they have worked with.

From the questionnaire data, it is evident that during the workshop process the percentage who answered 'a great deal' or 'a lot' to whether they have learned something about the topic they have worked with in their group increases from 70-88% (see table for Q2 in the appendix). Therefore, it must be presumed that the children continuously in the process learned more and more about the topic. Additionally, the children were asked about the different perspectives of learning about the topic. The results of these answers are shown in the table below:

Q5 - Topic

The percentage is the collective percentage of participants who answered, 'Strongly agree' or 'Somewhat agree'

	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4	Workshop 5
I contribute with my perspectives on our topic	93.75 %	93.75 %	94.74 %	100 %
We are creating something new together as a group	95.32 %	95.83 %	97.37 %	100 %
I learned something about the issue that I didn't know before	78.13 %	81.25 %	84.21 %	100 %
The topic we are working with is relevant and important	98.44 %	93.75 %	92.10 %	100 %

From the table, it is evident that there is a general increase in each workshop when concerned with whether the participants shared their perspectives on the topic (from workshop 2: 93.75% to workshop 4: 94.74%), whether they created something new together (from workshop 2: 95.32% to workshop 4: 97.37%), and whether they learned something about the issue that they did not know before (from workshop 2: 78.13% to workshop 4: 84.21%). Moreover, there is a decrease in the percentage of children who answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' to whether the topic they worked with was relevant and important from workshop 2 (98.44%) to workshop 3 (93.75%), and to workshop 4 (92.10%). However, in the end survey, 96.72% of the children answered 'extremely important' or 'very important' to the question on how important they thought the topic

they worked with was (see table for Q5.1 in the appendix). This indicates that even though there is a decrease through the workshop process, the collective final result is that the children thought that the topic was important and relevant.

One of the participating children further explained this in an interview where he highlighted how sharing perspectives in the group has also contributed to a greater understanding of the topic:

Hearing different perspectives, really made me more interested in the topic, more than I already was anyway, and it made me... I just appreciate the whole idea of the General Assembly more in the sense that I could come... Well, yeah, I could really see what the whole point was, you know, discussing different perspectives and coming up with solutions as one group, right? And the fact that we were looking at how we cooperated, I think also had a major part of that. (Interview with child)

The increased understanding and learning achieved through the sharing of perspectives, which is evident in the quote above, is also generally something the children highlighted. Common for the knowledge about different issues and topics is that the children talked about how they had learned about these different issues and topics by collaborating in their group. In an interview, a participant talked about how she felt that her group developed a shared knowledge foundation. The shared knowledge was developed by different perspectives from each other and was not necessarily knowledge they could have obtained themselves (interview).

The facilitators also experienced how the co-creational approach contributed to building a common knowledge foundation in the group. They explained how the children shared knowledge with each other, learned from each other, and created something together (interview). Additionally, the data from the questionnaires show that the percentage of facilitators who agreed that the children were engaged, motivated, focused, and showed enthusiasm and excitement about the topic ranges from 85-100% for all workshops (see table for Q7 in the appendix).

From the results above, it can thus be concluded that the children generally experienced an increased understanding of the topic and that it was important and relevant. They both experienced that they shared perspectives and learned something about the topic together by sharing knowledge and creating a shared knowledge foundation. These results indicate that the children by participating in CGA became more knowledgeable about their chosen topic and the associated issue as well as they thought that it was exciting and educational.

4.2 Knowledge about CGA and the world

Through the children's participation in the Children's General Assembly, the evaluation results also show that there was created an understanding of and learning about the world.

In the end survey, 94.91% of the children answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' to whether they had learned more and gotten more knowledge about the world (see table for Q3.4 in the appendix). 96.72% of the children answered 'strongly agree' or 'somewhat agree' to whether they could see a connection between the issue, themselves, their local environment, the others', and the world (see table for Q6.1 in the appendix). Moreover, 96.61% of the children answered with a 'very happy' or a 'happy' smiley when asked if they thought that Children's General Assembly contributed to building a better world (see table for Q6.1 in the appendix). It is

also evident from the results that the percentage of children, at the individual workshops, who felt that they had learned 'a great deal' or 'a lot' about the Children's General Assembly lies between 70-88%, which is not as high as the other parameters. Thus, these results indicate that the children's specific learnings about the Children's General Assembly are a little lower but that the children through the process gained a great understanding of and about the world.

This is also evident from interviews with some of the participating children and their parents, where it is highlighted how their participation in the Children's General Assembly was a contributing factor in making a difference. Overall, the children expressed that they had been proud of the opportunity to participate in the Children's General Assembly, and they felt they were making a difference – and were happy to be able to make a difference:

I'm proud of helping and contributing [...] I'm also really happy to have been participating. (Interview with child)

The children also expressed that they experienced how children could make a difference in the world, and they experienced how the purpose of the Children's General Assembly is to give children a voice (interview). Through their participation, the children experienced that they have a place in the world and that they were able to contribute with different perspectives. This is also evident in the quote below, where one of the participating children highlights how the differences in the groups have contributed to knowledge about the world:

I heard of different points of view, so I've learned something about what happens in Denmark or Austria rather than just in Italy. Also, I learned about the different cultures, and also how different people in different countries see these issues. (Interview with child)

The opportunity to meet other children from other parts of the world, that the children have gotten through the Children's General Assembly, has thus also contributed to creating active learning for the children. This was also something the parents pointed out. The parents noted how their children had learned from the different perspectives expressed in the workshops by the group members because of the group members' different backgrounds. This is highlighted by multiple parents in the interviews:

I think the biggest thing that she was able to learn from this, is that there is a world that is very diverse, that is very different and the socio-economic impact of what things can have in this world are very different from how her life is from how the life of other children is in different parts of the world. (Interview with parent)

I certainly believe that [my child] has learned a lot ... both from the process but also something about the recognition of, well, that it might be some wildly different things [...] that might be important in Japan or in some of the other countries where she has been in a group with someone. [...] I certainly believe that it has been an eye opener in relation to gaining a somewhat broader perspective on the world. (Interview with parent)

Based on the results above, the children experienced that the Children's General Assembly contributes to building a better world. Furthermore, it is clear that they through the meeting with other children have learned about the world and can both see the differences between them and

a connection between themselves and the world. Thus, it can be presumed that the Children's General Assembly contributes to the children's understanding of and contribution to the world.

4.3 Learning about and developing personal competencies

From the children's participation in the Children's General Assembly, the development and learning of personal competencies are seen as a central perspective. The following section further expands on this, taking its starting point in the evaluation data from questionnaires and interviews with both the children, facilitators, and parents.

In the end survey, the children were asked to relate to whether they thought that they had developed on a series of parameters. The results from these answers are shown in the table below:

Q3.4 - How do you think you have grown on the following topics?

The percentage is the collective percentage of participants who answered, 'Strongly agree' or 'Somewhat agree'

	End Survey
I have learned to collaborate with other people	96.72 %
I have become more aware of listening to different perspectives	95 %
I have learned the importance on sharing my own opinion	95 %
I have learned more about the world and grown my knowledge on the world	94.91 %
I have tried different roles throughout the workshops	83.34 %
I have used different skills (e.g., being creative, observation in your local community, interviews)	91.80 %
I have learned to give feedback to others	100 %

From the results above, it is especially worth noticing that the children learned to give feedback and collaborate. Additionally, they also learned to share their opinions and perspectives as well as used different skills. This is also expressed in the observations of the workshops. Here it is seen that the children paid attention to each other's ideas, listened, gave feedback, and were patient with one another. Most of the children seemed comfortable with stating their opinions, giving feedback to the others, and asking clarifying questions if they had any. The children seemed concentrated throughout the workshops and well prepared before each workshop. And even if they did not feel well prepared, they overcame their fears and took risks (observations).

This is also expressed in interviews with the children. In an interview, a participant expressed how the experience of participating in the Children's General Assembly has taught her to speak up and express her own opinion.

I have learned to open myself with different people also in different like places in the world, so it has been really helpful for me too because usually I'm kind of a shy girl but, like at the first meeting, I was really shy, but then like getting to know people and getting to talk. Like sharing my ideas was really helpful. (Interview with child)

In the quote above she describes herself as shy in usual settings but getting her own ideas in the setting of the workshops has been rewarding and given her self-confidence. The development of self-confidence while contributing is expressed by another participant as well:

It has made me more confident in terms of what I can do, and what I can do with other people.
(Interview with child)

In an interview with another boy, he also talked about how he had trouble speaking in public, but he overcame his fear and did anyway. In general, the children highlighted confidence as a skill they had the opportunity to foster when participating in the Children's General Assembly. A central learning for the children has thus been that they have gotten more confidence through the process by having to share perspectives with each other. Furthermore, they felt safe with each other which gave them the opportunity to learn to talk about their opinions and give each other feedback.

From the table above it is also evident that the children did not, to the same degree, experience having tried different roles. Here, only 83.34% of the children answered that they agree. This parameter is also relatively low throughout the workshops where only between 55-88% of the children stated that they had learned 'a great deal' or 'a lot' about their own role (see table for Q2 in the appendix). However, a continuous increase is seen for this parameter, which indicates that there, to a certain degree, were moments of learning but not to the same degree as the other parameters. Based on this, it is recommended that it should be a focus area in the planning for the next process. Additionally, there should be a focus on whether it is possible to create better opportunities for the children to be able to learn to enter different roles through the process.

The development of personal skills like the ones mentioned above is also recognized by the parents and facilitators. A parent describes how she experienced how her son took ownership through the process:

I feel like the kind of ownership that he's had as he's gone through the process has been really, really impressive. (Interview with parent)

She as a parent noticed how the form of collaboration, and involvement applied in the workshops, created an environment for her son to develop.

This development is also evident when the facilitators were asked about the children's development in the questionnaire. These results are shown in the table below:

Q11 - Choose how much you agree or disagree in the following statements related to your experience with how the children seemed to take risks and trying new roles during the workshop. Risk taking is about how the children having trust and confidence in the process, trying out new roles, and continuing despite challenges and resistance.

The percentage is the collective percentage of facilitators who answered, 'Strongly agree' or 'Somewhat agree'

	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4	Workshop 5
The children ventured into something new and unknown	100 %	70 %	85.72 %	100 %
The children expressed to have changed their minds or left ideas	88.24 %	77.78 %	71.43 %	50 %
The children expressed being surprised about something	58.82 %	40 %	57.14 %	100 %
The group overcame difficulties or challenges (if any)	66.66 %	66.66 %	71.43 %	50 %
The children elaborated on each other's ideas	100 %	100 %	85.72 %	50 %
The children tried different roles in the group	64.70 %	14.29 %	33.34 %	100 %
The children enjoyed playing (icebreakers and energizers)	87.50 %	77.78 %	66.66 %	50 %

The results above indicate that the facilitators experienced that the children due to their participation in Children's General Assembly dared to participate in something new and unknown. Their perception of whether the children were surprised, were, however, not that high, which must mean that the children felt well prepared for the unknown learning processes. On the other hand, the children did not change their opinions the longer into the workshop series they got, which is natural as they through the workshop series moved toward a shared idea and solution. For workshop 4, it is in this workshop that most pointed to the children overcoming challenges which must indicate that collecting their perspectives and turning them into a shared product was the biggest challenge. Generally, the facilitators did not experience that the children experienced trying different roles, which is in line with the children's own experiences.

From the results above, it can thus be concluded that both the children themselves, their parents, and the facilitators recognized development in both self-confidence, trust in the process, ownership, and collaboration as personal skills and learnings for the participants. However, the children did not to the same degree learn to enter new roles, which is why it is recommended as a focus in the future planning of the next Children's General Assembly.

Conclusion

Based on the presentation and analysis of the evaluation results, the following section sums up the central conclusions found in the analysis. In continuation hereof, a series of recommendations are made, which can be used as a starting point for the planning of the future courses in the Children's General Assembly.

For the evaluation of the **workshops**, it is applicable that both children and facilitators were satisfied and had a good experience participating in the workshops. However, a general picture is that workshops 3 and 4 were not as successful as the other workshops, as well as some in general had trouble with the homework assignments. Yet, the children felt that there was a good connection between the workshops and that they were well prepared beforehand. Moreover, the workshop process and its output were meaningful for the children. The results also show that the parents played a central role in supporting their children throughout the workshop process.

Regarding the **facilitation**, the evaluation shows that the facilitators generally had a good experience but that they could have been better prepared for facilitating the workshops. Moreover, the evaluation shows that the methods used created a foundation for the co-creational approach where the children felt that they were included in a safe and trusting room for participation. However, in the workshops there was a general problem with managing to go through the planned program and the workshops were characterized by a series of challenges with amongst other things 'virtual burnout' and interruptions in the program in the form of technical issues.

The evaluation of the **teamwork** shows that the children collaborated and had good opportunities for participation as well as that the communication between the children was characterized by them having the opportunity to share their perspectives and listening to each other. The collaboration between the facilitators was successful for some and less successful for others. The results also show that there generally was a wish for more time and the opportunity to socialize more and form relations between the children. Additionally, the results show that there was a need for more transparency in the selection of representatives and peers.

For the evaluation of **the children's knowledge about the topic and general learning**, the results show that the children learned about and gained an understanding of the topic and the issue they worked with as well as got more knowledge about the world. The children also learned multiple personal competencies through their participation, such as the ability to give feedback, and experienced increased confidence. However, the evaluation also shows that the children did not to the same degree learn to try out new roles.

Recommendations

Taking a starting point in the conclusions above for the evaluation of the Children's General Assembly, the following recommendations are made:

- Recognizing the importance on different ways of safeguarding with and around the children throughout the whole process
- Continue working with supporting, guiding, and creating a meaningful and clear connection throughout the whole workshop process – leaving room for facilitators to adjust along

- Rethink and consider the program for the individual workshops, especially focused on length, number of methods, and variation (inclusive breaks and energizers)
- Workshops 3 and 4 should be a focal point in the future planning of the workshop process
- An increased focus on how the homework assignments can be solved by all participating children on equal footing
- Create better opportunities for the children to have different roles in the workshop process
- Reflect on experiences with the use of resources in the workshops and their user-friendliness
- Cultivate the opportunity for more relation formation between the children - both during and outside the workshops
- Even clearer communication about the entire process, including times for workshops and the organization of representatives/peers
- Focus on and recognize the parents' supportive role to the children and consider whether this should be supported by further preparation for the parents
- Additional training and preparation of the facilitators as well as supporting the relations between the facilitators
- Consider whether it is possible that even more children get the opportunity to participate even more through the entire process
- Less evaluation data

Wishes from the children

In the survey, the children also expressed their wishes for the project in the future. They wish:

1. To continue Children's General Assembly in the future, and that it will keep on growing bigger
2. To create awareness on different issues, that are important to them and that they have been working with, in the groups. They wish to involve more people
3. To let the voice of children be heard even more. That the world leaders will listen more to children, and that more children should have the opportunity to get their voices heard and be taken seriously
4. That the leaders of the world and UN listen to the manifesto and act on behalf of it
5. That Children's General Assembly will lead to fair and real results and specific suggestions on solutions that will make the world a better place. That the ideas talked about during the process will be realized and implemented