RISE VOICE VOTE

EVALUATION REPORT

CELEBRATING OUR PAST | UNDERSTANDING OUR PRESENT | PARTICIPATING IN OUR FUTURE

Manchester Metropolitan University

Table of contents

Abbreviations used in the report:

Bangladeshi Girls Group - BGG

Chorlton High School - CHS

Co-op Academy North Manchester - CANM

East Manchester Academy - EMA

Loreto High School - Loreto

Manchester Academy - MA

Manchester Communication Academy - MCA

Manchester Enterprise Academy - MEA

Manchester Pupil Referral Unit - MPRU

Manley Park Primary - MPP

Whalley Range 11-18 High School - WRHS

Withington Girls' School - WGS

Xaverian College - Xaverian

Introduction

This important and innovative project was conceived as part of the centenary celebrations in 2018, a hundred years after some women were first able to vote in the UK. It concerned engaging young people in activism and encouraging them to consider how they can express their political views, in order to "Rise Voice Vote". This was a collaborative and intergenerational piece of work wherein established campaigners took part in developing and delivering workshops to young people in schools and at the Pankhurst Centre, in Manchester. A number of the students involved also took part in a range of additional visits, during 2018.

During Rise Voice Vote, the young people identified a campaign idea and developed this via a visit to Manchester's Pankhurst Centre and then at school, finally they came together in a "Campaign Hack Day" in November of 2018. [1] This resulted in some very positive feedback from participants: today we rotated between sessions looking at how to improve our campaigns and creating posters, badges, t-shirts and much more (anon). Another added: I don't have a favourite part, because I enjoyed all of it today (MEA) echoing widespread enthusiasm. Others learnt: that everything can be changed, if people want to see the change (anon) and that us young people can make a change (anon).

Importantly, the Rise Voice Vote team have now developed an online toolkit to allow this project to be replicated in the future, for other students. The team wants to thank to everyone who has taken part in the project and contributed their time, ideas and energy and a list of acknowledgements is given below, in Appendix 1.

This evaluation is written by Katie Parker and Dr Kate Cook and details the theory and methods used in collating the information here. The report also summarises some literature and ends with recommendations for further work. Firstly, however, here is a brief description of the evolution of the project which is also analysed in more detail, later on.

Rise Voice Vote was originally funded for a year but there was always an ambition to make this into an ongoing programme. The application for funding included two projects, a curational one and the youth engagement project which was eventually named Rise Voice Vote. The funding came through the Government's Centenary Cities programme[2] and was routed through Manchester's Pankhurst Centre, the "birthplace of the suffragette movement".[3] The government funding aimed to "celebrate, educate, participate" and this provides a good sketch of the aims of this Rise Voice Vote project: to celebrate the achievements of feminist activism; to educate young people about those achievements and to encourage them to participate in creating future change.

The project was inspired by feminism but never aimed to be women-only. In early meetings the steering group talked about a "women-led feminist space" and there were some boys and men involved in the events. The funding covered Manchester City Council area only, so, whilst there was a wish to include schools and other groups in Greater Manchester that was not funded. The original project brief aimed to interact with those aged 13-18 although some of the young people who took part were younger, with one Year 6 group involved (aged 10-11 years).

The first steering group meeting took place on 21st January 2018, so, by the time the funding was confirmed, some of the centenary year had already passed. The original aim was that from July to November the young people would work on developing a campaign, for launch in December to coincide with the unveiling of the statue of Emmeline Pankhurst, in St. Peter's Square, Manchester. As is detailed below, the project proved a little more complex to deliver and there were some delays and some evolution of aims. Nevertheless, 7 schools eventually took part in the Hack Day and 13 groups and schools took part in sessions beforehand. In addition, some of the schools were also involved in other events such as the procession to St. Peter's Square on 14th December 2018 for the unveiling of the new statue.

Comparable Literature

In writing this evaluation, the authors have looked for similar initiatives to compare the work to. Rise Voice Vote can be understood as being an educational project; one concerned with enfranchisement and also as being about activism and change. This brief review tends to focus on the projects concerned with enfranchisement of young people, as there have been a number of these fairly recently, and even locally. These types of projects are arguably the closest in focus to Rise Voice Vote, hence their selection. However, this does mean that less time has been spent considering wider literature which looks at the impact of school-based educational initiatives.

In that field, there is a wide range of choice. One report was Gail McVey and colleagues' useful evaluation of a body image educational programme. [4] This showed that the classes improved girls' assessment of their body image but that these changes had decreased in a 12-month follow-up. This lesson is perhaps transferable as it may well be important to embed educational initiatives more widely, within school curricula, in order to create lasting change for the young people.

Writing at the end of the twentieth century, Debi Roker and colleagues looked at the activism of young people aged 14 to 16 years. [5] Their review begins by challenging stereotypes of this age-group as alienated and not interested in the needs of others. They cite readily available data to demonstrate that young people do get involved in political groups such as Amnesty International and Greenpeace. [6] Roker et al's research involved asking youngsters in three comprehensive schools about their voluntary and activist activities. They found that significant proportions of these young people were involved in regular volunteering or campaigning activities (146 or 12.6% of the sample). [7] They also saw that significantly more girls than boys were involved in regular volunteering or campaigning, had given money to charity and had signed petitions. [8] This is interesting in terms of Rise Voice Vote which also saw greater participation from young women (discussed further below). Roker et al's study is worthy of a deeper review than there is space for here, but their conclusions include some strong points about the importance of voluntary and activist involvement in the evolution of political awareness amongst the young. [9] Such conclusions are clearly supportive of the work of Rise Voice Vote, which directed young people towards creating their own campaigns.

One of the better established short-course initiatives, which aim to have an impact on young people's sense of enfranchisement, is the National Citizen Service (NCS) programme which has had over 300,000 participants. An evaluation of the 2016 programmes shows that the young people who took part were overwhelmingly positive about the experience. [10] The other measures of success of the NCS programme (which focus on value for money) also suggest that initiatives of this type can make a real impact.

The work of UpRising, a UK-wide youth leadership organisation, interested in creating more diversity in Westminster by encouraging young people from diverse backgrounds to consider political careers, is also worthy of consideration. UpRising's leadership programme was evaluated by Demos (an independent educational charity) in 2016. [11] The evaluation used UpRising's own theory of change, measuring the "knowledge, networks, skill and confidence" [12] of the participants and concludes that the 2014/15 cohort demonstrated significant positive outcomes, arising from the programme. [13]

Whilst the Rise Voice Vote programme did not have such specific aims as the UpRising leadership course, there are clear parallels. Both aimed to increase participation amongst young people, indeed the Demos evaluation specifically measured the participants' involvement in the 2015 general election. This evaluation has not had access to comparable data, but nevertheless suggests that the young participants' interest in political issues has been sparked by their involvement in Rise Voice Vote.

Another Demos report [14] puts this work into context, illustrating that young people tend to have a lack of trust in government and parliament and (perhaps consequently) have low political engagement. This helps to illustrate the importance of work such as the UpRising programme and the Rise Voice Vote project, in encouraging youngsters to have more confidence in the possibility for change through action.

Youth leadership charity, RECLAIM has developed an Educating All programme to combat barriers that working class students face, within higher education. [15] Whilst class barriers were not always explicit within the Rise Voice Vote project, they were certainly of interest to the steering group members. The RECLAIM report makes it clear that working class students tend to have less confidence and consider that some institutions are not suitable for them. It is clear from the findings that follow, that participation in Rise Voice Vote is likely to have improved the sense of entitlement (to involvement in change) amongst all of the young people.

There are other strong initiatives at present, which aim to enhance young people's involvement in activism and one of these is the Girlguiding Action for Change programme. Whilst there does not appear to be a formal evaluation of this, there is strong testimony on the website, from the girls involved. [16] In all, the literature reviewed demonstrates that the Rise Voice Vote team is not alone in being concerned with young people's interest in politics but also that this project is capable of producing useful results for the participants.

[4]McVey, G. et al, Evaluation of a School-Based Program Designed to Improve Body Image Satisfaction, Global Self-Esteem, and Eating Attitudes and Behaviors: A Replication Study, International Journal of Eating Disorders, 36(1), 2004, pp.1-11.

[5]Roker, D.; Player, K. and Coleman, J. Young People's Voluntary and Campaigning Activities as Sources of Political Education, Oxford Review of Education, 1999, 25:1-2, 185-198.

[6]Ibid, pp. 186-7.

[7]Ibid, p. 189.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Ibid, pp.195-6.

[10]Panayiotou, S. et al, National Citizen Service 2016 Evaluation, Kantar Public, 2017, available here: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/678057/NCS_2016_EvaluationReport_FINAL.pdf, accessed 7.1.19.

[11]Wybron, I. "UpRising aims to open up pathways to power for talented young people from diverse backgrounds...": Evaluation of UpRising's Leadership Programme, 2016, available here: https://demos.co.uk/project/uprising-evaluation/, accessed 7.1.19.

[12]Ibid, p.11.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Wybron, I.; Vibert, S. and Smith, J. Next Generation UK, 2016, p.7, available here: https://demos.co.uk/project/next-generation-uk/, accessed 7.1.19.

[15]Manyeh, T. and Hilton, M. Educating All: Working Class Students' Perspectives on Barriers within Higher Education, circa 2017, available here: https://www.reclaim.org.uk/educating-all2, accessed 7.1.19.

[16]https://www.girlguiding.org.uk/social-action-advocacy-and-campaigns/social-action-and-campaigns/action-for-change-campaign/, accessed 15.1.19.

Theory and Method

The evaluation was begun by feminist activist and academic, Dr Kate Cook and another feminist activist, Katie Parker, was added to the team when it became apparent that extra input would make a big difference, particularly at the Hack Day.

The theoretical underpinning of this work is feminism and the project was also part of the celebration of the centenary of "Votes for women". It is interesting to think about the links between the suffragettes and others working towards suffrage, and the empowerment of young women. At the end of the nineteenth century, when the pro-suffrage movement was very active,[17] a major parallel concern was the education of girls.[18] Indeed, two of the schools involved in this project were founded in that era, to provide secondary education to girls[19] and it is therefore reasonable to understand Rise Voice Vote as building directly on the concerns of the suffrage pioneers.

Concerns about girls' empowerment were also always central to the so-called "second wave" of feminism, from the 1960s on. Shulamith Firestone was one of the founder members of the Redstockings group. She says that:

We must include the oppression of children in any programme for feminist revolution or we will be subject to the same failing of which we have so often accused men: of not having gone deep enough in our analysis, of having missed an important substratum of oppression merely because it didn't directly concern us (emphasis in original).[21]

Note that Firestone is discussing the oppression of "children", not only girls. The literature discussed above highlights that girls are more likely to be involved in charitable giving and activism than boys. This, perhaps, fits patriarchal norms, with girls displaying the "feminine" trait of compassion and boys engaging less with that attribute. If that is true, then it is clear that a project based in feminism should aim to include boys, as a challenge to those patriarchal norms. Rise Voice Vote has aimed to include all young people, however, as already mentioned, more girls than boys actually became involved.

The methods used in this evaluation suffered from some of the same difficulties as the remainder of the project, in terms of a lack of time for thought, reflection and pilots. It is easy now, with hindsight, to see that more data could have been collected throughout and that the evaluation might have become more insightful if there had been time to pilot and refine the questions.

However, a good deal of information was collected for this report. Kate was able to take part in all of the steering group meetings and kept a reflective diary which has been used to (re-)construct the outline of the development of the project, below. The team also observed one Pankhurst Session and one school session, plus the Hack Day itself. Again, the notes from these observations have been used in constructing what follows.

The team have also had access to the student's feedback from the Pankhurst Centre sessions, the school visits and the Hack Day. The blank feedback forms used are within the toolkit resources, and are also included here in Appendix 3. Summary results of the feedback are given below and comments from the forms are used throughout. In addition, Katie was able to collect a few "post-it note" reflections and conduct Vox-pop interviews with some of the young people and facilitators at the Hack Day. Some of these facilitators and other volunteers have also completed feedback forms. All of this has been used to inform and illustrate the report. Film and audio clips were also taken throughout the various sessions to demonstrate the content and capture some immediate feedback from the young people, activists, creative people and school staff who participated. A number of these are available on the website somewomen.uk/risevoicevote.

Finally the steering group members, plus the Pankhurst Centre facilitator have completed reflective feedback on the experience of the project, at the beginning on 2019, after all the sessions had taken place (the questions are given below, in Appendix 4). Altogether it is hoped that these varied sources provide a rich outline of the project and have allowed for some collective reflection on what went well and on what might be changed in future.

[17]Liddington, J. And Norris, J. One Hand Tied Behind Us: The Rise of the Women's Suffrage Movement, Virago, 1978.

[18]An article on the Girls' Day School Trust website discusses this history: https://www.gdst.net/article/gdst-pioneers-empowering-women-and-girls-then-and-now, accessed 17.1.19.

[19]Withington Girls School was founded in 1890: https://www.wgs.org/about-withington/history-and-founders/founders-withington-girls-school/, accessed 17.1.19. Whalley Range High School for girls was founded in 1891: https://www.manchestereveningnews.co.uk/news/local-news/classroom-memories-which-stretch-back-over-1164127, accessed 17.1.19.

Ethics

The team considered the ethical standards published by the Social Research Association,[22] in designing the evaluation. These direct researchers to consider: upholding scientific standards; compliance with the law and avoidance of social and personal harm.[23] The team also noted that the project design was inevitably impacted by the safety standards and ethical concerns of the schools involved. In all then, within the constraints of this short project, the team has aimed to work respectfully and ethically.

One additional concern that arose in relation to the youngest group that took part in the project is worth considering here. During the year the Rise Voice Vote team decided to test the sessions with a year 6 group, in order to consider how they might need to be adapted, to become suitable for primary school-aged children. Steering group member Eve Holt reports that:

We therefore facilitated two workshops at the Pankhurst with year 6 pupils (total of 60 pupils). This went very well with good feedback from pupils and teachers. However, given the content of some of the campaigns that the older secondary school-aged pupils decided to work on for the Hack Day, we decided it was not appropriate for the year 6 pupils to join the Hack Day and have arranged to run a separate event in-school for them instead.

This helps to demonstrate the work that the Rise Voice Vote facilitators have been willing to put in as well as their thoughtfulness, in relation to the young people.

Evolution of the Rise Voice Vote Project

This discussion outlines the development of the project, bringing out some of the challenges created by trying to develop a fresh educational initiative in just 11 months. The project always aimed to be influenced by collaboration and discussion and so some of the evolution of ideas was a natural part of that process. As Steering group member Tessa Chynoweth says:

Ideally, we'd have had more time! The idea of co-production and collaboration is hugely important for a project like this, which needs to build on the knowledge and skills of all the groups involved. The tight timeline meant that we weren't really able to fully explore how the project might best serve schools, youth groups, women's organisations and the Pankhurst Centre, whilst meeting the demands of delivery and the targets for engagement.

The original steering group was made up of the fund-holders (Gail Heath from the Pankhurst Trust, Eve Holt and Nicola Waterworth from Happen Together CIC) with Kate Cook from the evaluation team as an observer. This group grew a little, as others joined the team (detailed below). The original vision had been to put together a larger steering group, with local activists, facilitators, women's groups and young people's organisations. However constraints of time and money meant that this was not achievable and this also meant that a good deal of the administrative burden fell on the two women from Happen Together CIC. Early on there was a very successful first meeting at the Pankhurst Centre with a range of local activists, however, over time Eve and Nicola found that it ended up being more practical to go out to the groups and meet them on a one-to-one basis.

Other original aims were for around 10 schools to take part in in-school workshops in the period leading up to Democracy Week (2-7 July). The steering group wanted to attract schools from across Manchester and include both private and state-funded schools. At the outset there were to be three Hack Days, to bring the young people together, by regions of Manchester. There was also an aim to include the stories of local women activists and politicians through the school sessions; however this was eventually delayed until the end of the project, for practical reasons.

At the steering group meeting on 19th February, details of the funding were still emerging, meaning that it was difficult to make a real start on planning. At that point a mission statement and strategic aims were not yet finalised. However Tessa Chynoweth had been employed by the Pankhurst Centre to oversee the curational part of the project and joined the steering group. At that time, this was called "Some Women" and the name "Rise Voice Vote" emerged later. In February the website somewomen.org was being developed and would include this project.

[22]https://www.redstockings.org/, accessed 17.1.19.

[21]Firestone, S. The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution, The Women's Press, 1979, (first published 1970), pp.101-102.

[22]Social Research Association, Ethical Guidelines, 2003. See also: http://the-sra.org.uk/research-ethics/ethics-guidelines/, accessed 7.1.19.

[23]The SRA Respect code, available here: http://the-sra.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/respect_code.pdf, accessed 7.1.19.

By 19th March, the website had been launched and at this point the steering group decided to invite schools who were already interested in Rise Voice Vote to a Sylvia Pankhurst Gender and Diversity Research Centre event, on 18th April, at which Helen Pankhurst was speaking. It was hoped that this would cement their interest in the project. The Rise Voice Vote programme had developed to include visits to the Pankhurst Centre and these became integral, with all of the schools/groups taking up this opportunity and it is hoped that schools will arrange future visits to the centre, adding to the legacy of this project.

Also in April a new layer of oversight was put in place with programme group meetings, at the Pankhurst Centre to oversee the Rise Voice Vote programme, the curational project and two other pieces of work, all taking place beyond the physical space of the centre. The partners continued to liaise with schools and community groups. The BGG was keen to do the programme and it was thought that this would create an interesting comparison with the school groups. It would provide an opportunity to test Rise Voice Vote with a non-school youth group and consider issues of diversity in relation to the programme. It was also thought that the involvement of a Black youth group might be a useful prompt to consider how the history of suffrage is represented at the Pankhurst Centre. Eventually 5 members of the group did visit the Pankhurst Centre and had a specially adapted three-hour session in place of the "school" session.

By April there were three confirmed schools, with three more interested. The geographical spread of the schools taking part was not as wide as had been hoped; most of the schools were in the south of Manchester although the CANM was a notable exception. It took a deal more energy than originally envisaged and the use of personal connections to schools, to actually get the engagement. In order to give time to find other schools a decision was made that some sessions would take place in the autumn term. Clearly this compaction of the programme must have impacted on what went on in schools, in terms of developing the students' own campaign ideas.

By this stage the programme that had emerged was for each school or community group to visit the Pankhurst Centre (to consider the past) and to have a community worker or politician visit the school (to consider the present) and then come together for the Hack Day (to work on the future of their campaign). By the May meeting, the project team had more or less enough schools involved and the idea of developing the programme into a toolkit was also discussed as one of the eventual outcomes. Three school sessions were to take place in democracy week, with the rest in September and/or October. It proved more complicated to accommodate community groups as these tended to meet outside of the working day making visits to the Pankhurst Centre difficult to arrange. There was a wish to include the Young Women's Health Project at the Proud Trust, but sadly it did not prove possible. The BGG ended up being the only community group to take part in the project.

By September there were more than enough schools/groups on board and lots of young people coming to the sessions but no group had confirmed for the Hack Day. This was to take place at the Peoples' History Museum as they had offered a venue large enough to house everyone. It was originally hoped there would be a mini protest march but this proved difficult to arrange on a logistical basis and in terms of how effectively this would work for the students. It was replaced with a lunchbox soapbox speech event where external stakeholders (politicians and activists) were invited in to listen and comment on the speeches.

Later meetings concerned the development of this report and the legacy initiatives. It is now appropriate to outline the sessions that the groups took part in.

What the project did

This discussion begins with a look at the total numbers of schools/groups and young people who took part in the various sessions. It then moves on to discuss each of the sessions, explaining the content and reviewing the effectiveness.

School/Youth Group	Age Range	Pankhurst Numbers	School Numbers	Hack Day Numbers	Visits	Teacher Numbers
Bangladeshi Girls Group	11-13	5	6	-	-	1
Chorlton High School & Chorlton High South	12-14	15	30	15	25	6
Co-op Academy North Manchester	14-15	15	15	14	15	2
East Manchester Academy	13-15	30	-	-	15	2
Loreto High School	12-13	14	20	15	12	2
Manchester Academy	13-14	15	-	-	-	2
Manchester Communication Academy	13-15	10	-	-	-	2
Manchester Enterprise Academy	11-14	12	30	14	-	2
Manchester Pupil Referral Unit	15+	6	6	-	-	4
Manley Park Primary	10-11	60	-	-	-	4
Whalley Range 11-18 High School	13-18	14	35	15	-	1
Withington Girls' School	16-17	10	10	9	-	2
Xaverian College	16-18	10	10	15	-	1
Totals	**10-18**	**216**	**162**	**97**	**67**	**31**

The table above shows that there were 475 attendances by over 216 young people aged 10-18 in the formal sessions that made up the core Rise Voice Vote project.

In addition, the Rise Voice Vote team facilitated young people's involvement (67 attendances) in a number of other events (detailed above in the "Visits" column). These visits are outlined further below. Given this, Eve Holt estimates that more than 300 young people took part in events related to Rise Voice Vote, during the year. Young people attended from across 12 schools/colleges plus one community group. As already noted, it had been hoped to include a wider range of schools and groups and, with more time, this might have proved possible. In the future, the online toolkit will enable other schools to get involved.

Altogether then the Rise Voice Vote project has engaged young people across Manchester in a range of activities, all designed to improve their political awareness and knowledge. The following discussions look at the three formal sessions that the young people took part in, in turn.

Pankhurst Centre Visits

The schools each attended a workshop at the Pankhurst Centre where they went into the parlour where the first meeting of the Women's Social and Political Union is said to have taken place and learned about the suffragette heritage. The visits were generally facilitated by Rachel Sills of the Pankhurst Trust, who has also contributed to this evaluation. There were attempts to include volunteers to support these sessions, but pressures of time meant that this was not achievable. However, it is hoped that the toolkit will enable others to work with volunteers, in the future.

At the Centre, the students watched a short video and looked at exhibits before having the chance to dress up in some period-style props within the parlour and pose for photographs. This got the students engaged in the history, from the very beginning of the session. The evaluation team noted that the students observed were clearly split in their views. They were asked whether feminism has reached its goal. The boys immediately said "Yes" which appeared to inspire the larger groups of girls to be equally vociferous in saying that it has not.

The students next viewed young activists' work (via photographs); looked at statistics on gender inequality and went on to develop a poster for their own campaign idea. The students observed were interested in a wide range of topics from: racial inequality; through the sexualisation of women; homelessness; gun violence and sexual violence. Rachel Sills says that the groups varied and that some, for example the groups that were part of their school diversity societies, were much more engaged with topical and social issues. For some, the statistics on gender inequality sparked discussion and reflection. For others the photos of young protestors or the gender equality timeline on display allowed them to consider issues they had not explored before. Yet others became engaged in the stories or images in the newspapers and magazines that were being used for making posters in the session. One student said that: the session encourages us to think critically, whilst being accessible to us (MEA).

The original thought was that there would be 20-40 participants in these sessions, but the size of the Pankhurst Centre meant that most of the groups were smaller, in practice. Rachel Sills adds that groups of around 8 students seemed to work best as the young people were more willing to voice an opinion in these smaller groups. The groups that she facilitated early on were mostly or entirely girls, but she did see some more mixed groups later on. Rachel added that it would have been interesting to have an all-boys group. As noted above, there was one Year 6 primary school involved, which added to the diversity of the young people and Rachel clearly felt these sessions were worthwhile. Finally, Rachel added that longer sessions at the Pankhurst Centre might well have produced more thoughtful participation from some of the young people. The students themselves made relatively few suggestions for change, but did ask for: a larger chance to voice our own personal opinions (WGS) and more competitive tasks (MCA).

At the session the evaluation team observed, the teachers said that they took about half of a group from their GCSE Citizenship class, so the group observed was considerably bigger than the ideal of 8. This was a very lively session, with strong participation from the students present. The best poster was awarded "achievement points" by the school and the teachers took pictures of students with their posters. The posters were then on display in the Pankhurst Centre and were taken along to the Hack Day to be used again, by the students. The session ended with students completing feedback forms and being given a Pank Zine to read before heading back to school. Rachel Sills added that the more engaged the teachers were, the more likely the young people were to also want to get involved in working on their own campaigns.

The young people who visited the centre were asked to rate their visit out of 5*. There were 130 feedback forms (60% of the visitors) and 103 of these give a star rating. 77 (75%) rated the visit at 5* whilst 24 (23%) rated is at 4* and just 2 rated their experience as low as 3* (2%). Students clearly learnt a great deal at the centre:

I enjoyed the session because women back then put themselves in a lot of danger just so women can have their rights to be equal to men and I appreciate what the suffragettes did (CHS).

I really liked our guide who was very knowledgeable and I liked the dressing up (WGS).

Finally, a student from MEA added: you've given me lots of ideas to think about how we learn political history in school. Thank you! Improve ..., by doing more of it.

School Sessions

The in-school session plans were developed by four women: Eve, Nicola, Hebe Phillips and Beth Nunn. Eve reports that these continued to adapt as the programme progressed, as we built on what worked. There were also adaptations to accommodate the groups, such as the longer session for the BGG, noted above and Eve adds that Xavarian could only accommodate a one hour session so the workshop was shortened. The in-school session with students at the secondary pupil referral unit proved difficult with the small room at the school providing a space which was not conducive to delivering the usual session. Following discussions with staff at MPRU it was agreed that the group would not get anything out of the Hack Day at that point and the team plan to run some alternative sessions for these students in future.

The evaluators observed a school session where the first activity was a sheet of questions about voting, equality and representation, followed by an introductory talk covering the same issues. The young people were split on whether the voting age should be lowered to 16, with some saying that what politicians do particularly impacts the lives of the young whilst others took the view that some youngsters are not mature enough for the responsibility. In the ensuing discussion it was clear that some of the young people were of the view that politicians do not adequately represent the young. One young woman said that: people in parliament are rich and white, which clearly made her feel this disenfranchisement. As with the Pankhurst Centre session, the participation and discussion was strong.

The next task looked at protest and whether it is acceptable to break the law, as the suffragettes did. Again, this produced good engagement and the students then ranked some ideas for campaigning in order from the least to the most effective. The ideas included: boycotts; social media usage; radio and podcasts; stunts; marches; chalking; pledges; posters and so on. As an observer it was apparent that the youngsters had not come across all of these campaign tactics before and so could have used more time to discuss what they meant. The students were then told more about the development of women's rights, particularly in the UK and were asked whether they consider themselves to be feminists. In general, they did not, but they were encouraged to understand that this can be an inclusive term, using the example of Canadian politician and feminist Justin Trudeau.

The next part of the session was a small group activity towards developing the students' campaigns. The groups were working on youth centres; knife crime and women's experiences of rape, amongst other topics. Most of the students were deeply involved and came up with strong campaigning ideas. At the end they were asked to fill in a "today I will ..." form to encourage ongoing action. They were also asked for evaluation forms and the teacher agreed to include feedback on the campaigns in a later session, as time became too tight. It seemed that more time might have allowed the students to develop their understanding more fully.

Feedback forms were received from 121 of the 162 young people involved in these sessions (75%) and 90 of these gave the school session a star rating. 55 (61%) rated the session at 5*; 28 (31%) gave it 4* and the final 7 (8%) allotted 3*. Clearly this is also a good strong rating, especially given this covers a number of different sessions in a variety of schools. The students reported that they enjoyed: creating our plan and working for the same cause (WRHS) and that they were given the time and freedom to discuss something that matters to us (WRHS). At MCA a student: enjoyed the participation aspect of today and what I learnt about women's rights. Meanwhile at MEA someone: enjoyed planning/ making our campaigns because it gave us time to work in teams and be creative. The BGG had a session that was personalised for them and this clearly paid off. One girl learnt: that there are simple things that can do to change things. Also that in Bangladesh there are women politicians.

There was no great consensus on what to change: maybe have a pop quiz about the suffragettes (Loreto); give ideas for people who can't agree on a campaign (MEA); make some countries that aren't that equal, equal (Loreto); more fun and interactive projects (BGG) and, finally: you could discuss different causes with other schools so we can all help (CHS).

In all, the school sessions clearly had impact. One teacher was moved to email to say that: today's session was amazing - the work and thinking was some of the best I have seen! (MEA).

Hack Day

The Hack Day took place at the Peoples' History Museum in Manchester on the 26th November 2018. The notion of a "hack" came from the thinking behind "hackathons", used in computer programming to describe times when several people and/or groups come together to find solutions. This model reflects the tone that the Hack Day aimed at, where creative "experts" or "advisors" were brought in, but where the space was non-hierarchical. The aim was to share and collaborate with the students, rather than to simply teach or impart knowledge.

By bringing young people together with creatives and activists with experience, skills and knowledge the hope was to pump-prime/ speed up their campaigns by offering a wide range ... of ideas and expertise in a condensed period of time. (Nicola Waterworth)

It proved quite difficult to book schools in for this event but, in the end, the venue was largely up to capacity. The room was full of young people representing: Loreto; MEA; WRHS; Xaverian; CANM; CHS and WGS. During the warm-up, each student was invited to pair up with someone not in their own school to greet and complement each other and they took part in this with enthusiasm. The atmosphere was lively and busy, with stalls set up around the edges of the space for the activities to come; graphic illustrator Carmen Byrne crafting a drawing to record the day and others filming or taking photographs. The young people were then asked to shout out affirmations such as "I am enough" and "I am worthy" and think about what they hoped to get from the day.

The Rise Voice Vote project was then introduced to them and an outline of the day was given (a copy is included in Appendix 2). The young people were asked to sit with their campaign group and discuss their ideas for 10 minutes. They each had a timetable for the sessions and were to work out who would go to each workshop. They might go and make placards or t-shirts; learn how to ask questions of politicians; or how to interview and so on.

Each student could attend two sessions before lunch. The feedback illustrates that this was not the smoothest of sessions, as not everyone understood the timetable or how many workshops they could take part in. There were also some logistical issues, with teachers asking what students should be doing with their coats and bags. It seemed that a little more explanation was needed, as one student put it: I would make the timetable less confusing (CHS).

That said, the young people did all move on to the stations around the room. At lunchtime there was a lunchbox soapbox speech event. Nicola explains that the young people spoke and

...external stakeholders (politicians, activists) were invited in to listen and comment on these speeches. This was less successful as getting people there proved tricky. It was unfortunate that we were unable to provide the opportunity to take the campaigns into the public arena that had originally been envisaged.

In the afternoon the young people continued to attend more workshops. Afterwards they came back together as a large group and some of the students got up to speak about what they had learnt including speeches, poems and thoughts that they had developed during the day. The feedback makes it clear that students valued many aspects of the Hack Day. A number of them were impressed by the opportunity to speak with Kate Green MP. A CHS student said this was their favourite aspect: MP video call - really interesting yet child friendly - students were really engaged.

Once the young people left, the volunteers, steering group members and workshop facilitators came together to reflect and share their highlights from the day. Feedback was collected on post-it notes, evaluation forms and via Vox Pops. 16 Facilitators and volunteers completed forms and these rated the day highly with most giving 5* (12, 75%; 4/5* 2, 12.5% and 4* 1, 6.25, the remaining form did not include a rating). Joe Morris of Sharp Futures perhaps summed this up: seeing the involvement of the kids gives me great hope.

72 of the young people present (74%) completed forms and these also graded the day well with 47% at 5* (34); 43% at 4* (31) and 10% at 3* (7). The Vox Pops added some real detail, a WGS student demonstrated how much she understood about gender inequality:

... until every woman everywhere gets exactly the same opportunities as her male counterpart, there won't be equality between men and women. Asked to explain she added: ... women are less likely to get hired for the same jobs because of maternity pay. LGBT women face daily struggles ... women ... have the horrible practice of genital mutilation ... there is no plain on which women are equal to men.

The Hack Day was quite an inspiring event for many who attended. Tessa Chynoweth says:

To witness self-aware, reflective discussion and debate happening between groups, un-facilitated and unprompted by any of the project team or teaching staff, was also pretty remarkable. I left the Hack Day feeling really quite hopeful for the future!

Asked, "So, what has been the best thing about the day so far?" one teacher at MEA said:

Having the students collaborate with other schools and to recognise that the issues that they have chosen are issues that other Manchester schools and young people care about. Being able to work with students from a range of schools, at different ages, especially the college students, it's giving that confidence that what they are doing isn't just a school thing, it's a bigger issue.

Additional events and visits

As part of the project the Rise Voice Vote team facilitated young people's involvement in a number of additional visits and events during 2018. These provided further opportunities for the young people and schools involved to learn, understand and participate. They also enabled the team to try out alternative venues and forms of delivery which supported the development of the Rise Voice Vote toolkit. These visits included the trip to the Sylvia Pankhurst Gender and Diversity Research Centre, mentioned earlier.

Students also participated in a schools' launch of the television programme The Making of a Militant[24] at the Pankhurst Centre, including: meeting the actress who played Emmeline, the film producer and hearing from the Mayor of Greater Manchester, Andy Burnham on the importance of the film and the suffrage movement in Manchester (Eve Holt).

In December, several schools were able to join the Vote 100 procession from the Pankhurst Centre to watch the unveiling of the statue of Emmeline Pankhurst in St Peter's Square. Finally, young people from two of the schools came together with schools from Bury and Tameside (see Appendix 1) for an event entitled GM Together, Past, Present and Future.

This included a visit to the new statue where I spoke about the women's movement in Greater Manchester, the role of the suffragettes and suffragists, and feminist activism ... The young people then participated in a debate in the council chamber (Eve Holt).

This was clearly a powerful experience for those who took part.

I found it really interesting and I loved how everyone had an opportunity to share an opinion and it shows that although we are young, and not able to vote yet, we can still have a say (student participant).

A member of staff added that this increased: confidence to explore their beliefs and consider the possibilities for the future.

This outline has showed that the Rise Voice Vote project involved young people from a diverse range of backgrounds, across Manchester, to learn more about activism. The session feedback, from all of the activities, gives strong evidence of the value of this work.

[24](2018) BBC, 18 June.

Evaluation findings

This final discussion brings together some of the achievements of the Rise Voice Vote project and looks to the future. In doing that, it is also useful to consider the aspects of the project that the team would do differently, in view of their experience during 2018.

Lessons Learned

Given that the funding was tied into a centenary year, it was naturally short-term and this created some restrictions on what could be achieved. As this report has noted, having more time would have created a smoother planning process and more opportunity to consider pilot sessions to test what works best.

In retrospect, the team considers that the approach to involving stakeholders could have been changed. In order to create more of a sense of ownership of the work it might have been more effective to have an initial planning day (which did take place) followed by some further regular meetings, every two or three months. Ideally the group would include activists, facilitators, politicians, schoolteachers and pupils so that schools and the young people themselves would be more closely involved with the project and its design. However it is also possible that a mixed approach would eventually emerge as suitable. As Tessa says:

More time would have also allowed us to develop a much clearer 'offer' that could have been publicised ahead of time. Although a few of the schools clearly relished being involved in the development of the programme, the majority of schools and facilitators wanted a much more clearly defined programme, with timetables and expectations set out at the beginning. The toolkit will offer this going forward.

There are other initiatives that might have produced a smoother outcome. The original budget for Rise Voice Vote did not include funding for train-the-trainer work with teachers and youth workers and this is now considered to have been an oversight. More input, at the beginning, into training these key participants would have paid dividends in terms of continuity and understanding of the project aims. For example, the steering group was concerned that they wanted the young people to have a free choice about getting involved but that schools might want to pick participants. Having more time to work with teachers beforehand could have given space for this to be discussed.

The original aim had been to include a project manager's post within Rise Voice Vote and, had that been possible, it should have improved the running of the project and allowed other key team-members to spend more time of creating collaborations and building the legacy of Rise Voice Vote.

More time to plan might also have avoided some logistical difficulties. For example, the posters created by the young people at the Pankhurst Centre were used again at the Hack Day. However it emerged that the names of schools had not been noted on the posters, so it was difficult to reunite them.

That said some of the changes that were made during the year perhaps produced stronger results. For example, the single large Hack Day event was very energetic and probably proved easier to get the range of activists and creative people together, than it might have been for the three days originally envisaged.

The young people were clearly inspired by some of the campaigns that they heard of, and it would have been useful to create more links between the young people and the activists involved in the project so that there could be ongoing participation. It is possible that an online platform would be useful in achieving this. In addition, the young people put together some powerful campaigns on important issues and whilst there is photographic evidence of this and testimony from the young people it could well be that their campaigns could have been documented more fully. Again, creating online space for the campaigns might have helped.

The literature review has shown that it is important to embed this type of work in the school curriculum, to enhance and perpetuate the students' sense of enfranchisement (above, per McVey et al). The Rise Voice Vote group has not created a way of measuring whether the schools are able to continue with the teaching, the campaigns or other influences arising from this project, but the toolkit will help provide what is needed to support schools and other youth settings in replicating the programme, or parts of it, themselves.

On reflection it is also clear that it would be useful to think again about the time spent on these sessions. One piece of feedback that is repeated here is that each of the sessions could generally have been longer. The school session that was observed appeared to be somewhat rushed and incomplete. Rachel Sills commented in her reflections that the Pankhurst Centre sessions could well have been longer. Finally, a number of the comments on the Hack Day involved the need for more time to set up and more time within the sessions themselves. Facilitator Beth Nunn suggested longer sessions and more chance to develop/sharpen campaigns further. Again this thought is carried through to the toolkit which provides a menu of session plans for teachers to choose from.

Gender split emerged as something of an issue, in that the project attracted more girls than boys. Two of the schools were all-girls schools, so perhaps overall, this was likely. However, it appears that this skewing sometimes occurred because of the process within the remaining schools. Tessa says:

We were very clear from the start that the project was open to both girls and boys, and that it was really important to engage young men in the history of women's suffrage and the fight for women's rights.

The literature suggests that girls are more engaged than boys with activism generally (above, per Roker et al) so it is possible that self-selection also played a role in this gender disparity. It would be worth thinking about how to word communications with schools to aim for a more representative group of young people. Again, this is carried into the toolkit. aiming to collect more data is something to take forward and perhaps can be more actively included, where schools decide to use this programme toolkit themselves.

Overall the Rise Voice Vote team recognises that there is a lack of data on diversity here and that it would have been worthwhile to try to collect more on gender, race, class, disability and (emergent) sexuality. In reality however it was not particularly easy to ask extra of the schools, who were fitting the programme into their busy schedules. So, We were very clear from the start that the project was open to both girls and boys, and that it was really important to engage young men in the history of women's suffrage and the fight for women's rights.

In general the project has, despite the lessons here, produced some very strong feedback and it is now appropriate to consider what this work has created.

Legacy

Overall it seems fair to say that the young people, the teachers and facilitators, the Pankhurst Centre and others who took part, all gained from this project. The feedback suggests that the young people who took part in Rise Voice Vote are likely to carry forward a stronger sense of enfranchisement, as a result, which accords with Roker et al's research considered earlier. As one WRHS student said: I have learned that our generation can make a change.

It was also clear that teachers, facilitators and activists involved took positive messages away from the Hack Day. One anonymous facilitator said: (I have) passed on some of what I've learnt over the years but much more importantly, seen what life looks like from their perspective.

An original aim was to: demonstrate the role the Pankhurst Centre, as a women's centre, can and does play as a hub for inter-generational, heritage rich activism in the international fight for equality. [25] It seems fair to say that this has been richly achieved. Eve adds that the sessions: have been refined over the course of the project and the Pankhurst Centre is now left with a great resource to support volunteers and staff running sessions with schools and young people. An adapted version can be run off-site by schools directly or by Pankhurst staff and/or volunteers if a visit is not possible. Tessa Chynoweth adds that there was a lot of learning for the Pankhurst Centre about working with external partners and that it would be useful if this was written up for future use.

As this report has indicated, the toolkit will enable others to use the Rise Voice Vote materials and to take advantage of the knowledge gained throughout this project and is a key part of the legacy. The toolkit will also allow volunteers to make use of the ideas within Rise Voice Vote and it will be interesting to see what they make of this going forward (Tessa). The toolkit will capture the stories from all of the work during 2018, on remembering and learning from the struggle for women's suffrage and make sure that there is a legacy in schools.

Conclusions

The idea behind Rise voice Vote was to use knowledge about the struggle for suffrage and other campaigns, to create a programme which would increase the political engagement of young people in Manchester. It was delivered by a dedicated team, over a tight timeframe and has produced strikingly strong feedback from students, facilitators and teachers alike.

The academic literature supports the ideas behind this piece of work, that campaigning activity by young people improves their personal sense of engagement with political ideas and (ultimately) with the political process. This project has done some very valuable work with a sizeable group of young people in Manchester which has allowed these participants some time and space to think about campaigns and to become campaigners. Rachel sums this up well:

Fantastic privilege to take part in the project, and to see how the young people engaged in the whole process, to become effective, confident and passionate activists.

Ideally the project could extend to more schools and groups. Now that the first phase of the project is complete, other schools/groups will be able to get a clear picture of how the project works and what they are signing up for, especially if the photos and footage of this year's project are used, and a clear, succinct outline of the project, with bookable dates for all sessions, are provided to schools.

Appendix 1

Collaborators and partners
These are the partners who helped the Rise Voice Vote team to bring the programme to life and the team wants to extend sincere thanks to all.

Key Delivery Partners:
The Pankhurst Trust (Lead Partner)
Happen Together CIC (Lead Delivery Organisation)
Manchester City Council
Evaluation Team
Sylvia Pankhurst Gender and Diversity Research Centre, Manchester Metropolitan University

Key collaborators and partners
42nd Street
Annana - Manchester Bangladeshi Women's Organisation
Be Braver
Carmen Byrne, illustrator and activist
Carol Whitehead, The Zebra Partnership, events management
Extinction rebellion
FIDO PR
Helen Pankhurst
Jane Bowyer, graphic designer and illustrator
Manchester City Councillors - Cllr Eve Holt, Cllr Zahra Alijah, Cllr Bernard Stone, Cllr Sue Murphy, Cllr Gary Bridges, Cllr Andrew Simcock
MMU Postgraduate students in International Events Management (volunteers)
Nasima Begum, poet and activist, Young Identity
People's History Museum
PIE teacher, facilitator
Prints & Press
R.E.D. Butterfly
Reclaim
Sharp Futures
Shirley May, poet and activist, Young Identity
SMMS Ltd (volunteers)
Street Support
The Federation, Co-op
The Politics Project
The Proud Trust
Tony Bussey, design
Uprising
Vic Turnbull, podcast producer and activist
WAST (Women Asylum Seekers Together)
Young Identity
Zoe Cox, activist & campaigner

Participants:
Bangladeshi Girls Group, Ananna
Chorlton High School
Chorlton High South
Co-op Academy North Manchester
East Manchester Academy
Loreto High School
Manchester Academy
Manchester Communication Academy
Manchester Enterprise Academy
Manchester Pupil Referral Unit
Manley Park Primary
Whalley Range 11-18 High School
Withington Girls' School
Xaverian College

Castlebrook High School, Bury*
Hyde Community College, Tameside*

* The final two schools took part in the event GM Together, Past, Present and Future,
but not in the remainder of the project.

Appendix 2

Campaign Hack Day: AGENDA

DATE: Monday 26th November 2018
ARRIVAL TIME: 10.00
FINISH TIME: 14.30
VENUE: People's History Museum, New Ct St, Manchester M3 3ER

OVERVIEW
The Rise, Voice, Vote youth engagement project connects Manchester's woman-led activism of past and present with local young people. The project seeks to inspire and support young people's political participation and community activism through shared stories, learning, participation and celebration. The project is working with a diverse group of young people (aged between 10-19) from schools, colleges, community groups and alternative education settings across Manchester.

 On 26th November approx 130 young people will come together at People's History Museum to develop their campaigns, utilising a mix of campaigning tools from the more traditional tools used over the last 100 years ago to modern day use of social media, videos, online petitions and vox pops. This will include the opportunity to speak to a local MP via video conference.

Young people will undertake a twitter and instagram #takeover of the @PankhurstCentre accounts. We have a growing list of creatives, women activists, campaigning groups and volunteers signed up to support the hack day including Reign, Young Identity, Vic Turnbull, the Fawcett Society and MMU Students Union.

PROGRAMME OVERVIEW
The Hack Day includes a range of activity sessions students will choose between. Given spaces are limited in some of these activities each campaign team from your school will receive an allocation of activity sessions and can decide which students go to which sessions when they arrive at the Hack Day. Details of the activities are included below the timetable.

TIMING	ACTIVITY
10.00-10.15	ARRIVALS
10.15-10.55	WHOLE GROUP ACTIVITY SETTING TONE & GROUND RULES FOR THE DAY. OPPORTUNITY FOR CAMPAIGN TEAMS TO ALIGN ON KEY CAMPAIGN MESSAGES & ALLOCATE ACTIVITIES.
10.55-11.55	ACTIVITY SESSIONS: 2 sessions of 30 minutes

11.55-12.15	LUNCH: students will being packed lunches
12.15-13.10	SPEAKERS CORNER: Students will be divided into 6 themes groups around soapboxes to make speeches, poems etc. A number of invited City Councillors, activists and campaigners will be attending to listen and ask questions. Map provided on day.
13.10-14.00	ACTIVITY SESSIONS: 2 sessions of 25 minutes
14.00-14.30	IMPACT, NEXT STEPS & EVALUATION
14.30	CLOSE

ACTIVITY SESSIONS

ACTIVITY	DELIVERED BY
Making Stations (Morning): • Badges & stickers • Placards & posters • T-shirts & bags • Rosettes / similar (tbc) **Up to 30 spaces**	• Zoe, Reign, Reclaim • Sarah Marie, University of Manchester • Rachel Sills, Pankhurst Trust
Songs, Chants & Poems *Developing spoken word in poetry, chants or songs to protest around the campaign.* Up to 20 spaces	• Shirley May & Nasima, Young Identity
Soapbox speeches Hone your speech writing skills for all occasions - be it soapbox or parliament how can you get your message across effectively! **Up to 20 spaces**	• Beth Nunn, PIE
Zine-Making Tell the story (or stories) at the heart of your campaign through zines. Learn how to make a zine with just one piece of paper and look through s collection of zines from Manchester LGBT Zine Library **Up to 5 spaces**	• Hebe Phillips, The Proud Trust
Asking Powerful Questions	• Harriet Andrews, The

Learn how to frame a powerful question that has an impact and how to build relationships with people in power. Workshop in preparation for the afternoon 'Digital Surgery'. (students choosing this will automatically do the Digital Surgery in the afternoon). **Up to 25 spaces**	Politics Project
Vox Pops & Podcasts Learn how to gather vital audio support and evidence for your campaign - with a phone and a sock! **Up to 15 spaces**	• Vic Turnbull, Silent Radio
Running a successful Social Media Campaign Learn how to master social media campaigning through creating your own content. You'll learn a history of the role that social media has played in recent campaigns, what makes a good or a post and how create your own eye-catching social media campaign. **Up to 20 spaces**	• Josh Dell, The Politics Project
Represent! How far have we come in 100 years? A space to reflect on the campaign for the vote and the campaigns of girls and women since then and today. And take part in poll **Votes at 16?** **Up to 25 spaces**	• MMU volunteers supervising
Digital Surgery In this workshop you will get the chance to talk to a politician and ask the questions that really matter. **(Students will have completed the 'Asking Powerful Questions session in the morning).** **Up to 25 spaces**	• Harriet Andrews, The Politics Project
Making Stations (afternoon): • Videos • Photos • Gifs **Up to 30 spaces**	• *Sharp Futures - POD and Creative Digital company*

Appendix 3

FOLLOW ON OPPORTUNITIES

There are a number of follow-on opportunities which you may be interested in participating in. If you are keen to participate in any of the following please let us know and contact the relevant people where indicated.

OurEmmeline Procession and Statue Unveiling - 14th December 2018
This includes participating in a walking procession from the Pankhurst Centre (or schools can start at the People's History Museum) to St Peter's Square to watch the unveiling of the Emmeline Pankhurst Statue. Schools to organise their own transport and supervision.   More information here at www.womanchesterstatue.org. Please email Esther at E.LiskCarew@pankhursttrust.org if you would like to join the procession at the Pankhurst Centre which will be leaving the centre at 11am sharp.

100 years on, now what? Manchester City Council Chamber - 17th December 2018
'Learning from our past, understanding out present, participating in our future'
Councillor Eve Holt is hosting an intergenerational debate in the Council Chamber providing an opportunity for young people to connect with older Manchester activists, community leaders and politicians to share stories, experiences and inspiration around the RiseVoiceVote themes. This will be combined with a visit to see the new Emmeline Pankhurst statue in St Peter's Square. Contact Eve Holt at cllr.eve.holt@manchester.gov.uk for more information and to book your places.

RiseVoiceVote digital launch and showcase - date TBC in February 2019
We are hoping to hold the digital launch at Sharp Futures, The Sharp Project, but this is TBC.
We will be launching the RiseVoiceVote toolkit and website early in the new year. This will also be an opportunity to showcase all the brilliant work that has been done by the young people involved in this project and to share their campaigns with a wider audience to include a panel of VIPs.
A limited number of spaces will be reserved for each of the partner schools. More information to follow.

RiseVoiceVote on tour - throughout 2019
We are keen to help amplify and spread the voices of young people and their campaigns. We would like to work with the partner schools to help facilitate a series of events across the schools to help showcase the work that has been done to include a pop-up exhibition and showreel.

Feedback Questions

Questions for the students at the Pankhurst Centre and school sessions:

1. Please let us know what you thought of today's session by circling the emoji that best represents your feelings: Ranking out of 5*, using emoji.

2. What did you enjoy about the session?

3. Did you learn anything new?

4. How could we improve it?

Hack Day questions, for students:

Answer as many questions as you can.

1. How many stars out of 5 would you give today?

2. How would you describe what you've done today, to someone who didn't come?

3. If you could do this again, what would you change?

4. What have you learnt about politics after attending today?

5. Have you had a favourite part of the day? Please explain.

Hack Day questions, for facilitators and volunteers:

1. How many stars out of 5 would you give today?

2. How would you describe what you've done today to someone who didn't come?

3. Can you comment on any ways in which this project has supported your students to engage with politics?

4.What would you change, if you did this again?