Ref. Ares(2020)6194975 - 31/10/2020

Horizon 2020 Grant nº 770309
Religious Toleration and Peace
*Granada, 31 October 2020*

# DELIVERABLE 1.6

# EVALUATION REPORT 1

Contributor(s): Elena Arigita

Institution: UGR

Contact: earigita@ugr.es

Related project task: 1.1

Type of document: Evaluation report 1

Document reference: D1.6

Version number: 1

Status: Working

Last revision date: 31/10/2020

Verification date & verifying subject: N/A

License: Public

Other, if applicable: […]

This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement n° 770309.

# Table of contents

**Introduction: Second consortium meeting in Granada** **3**

**1. The impact of the COVID-19 in the organization of the second consortium meeting** **3**

**2. The on-line meeting** **4**

**2.1. 16 September** Error! Bookmark not defined.

2.1.1. Agenda for the first day **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

2.1.2. WP 2 Historical Peace Treaties and Agreements 7

2.1.3. WP 6 on Policy impact: education and religious dialogue 9

2.1.4. WP 7 on Communication, dissemination and exploitation 9

2.2. 17 September 10

2.2.1. Agenda for the second day **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

2.2.2. WP 5 Impact on Education 11

2.2.3 WP 8 Ethical Issues. Setting up a strategy 15

2.2.4. WP 6 Policy impact: education and religious dialogue 16

## Introduction: Second consortium meeting in Granada

This document reports the outcomes of the first mid-term meeting of RETOPEA, held on 16 and 17 September 2020. The main aim of the meeting was twofold. A first aim was to revise and evaluate the work done during the first two years. A second aim consisted of reflecting together on how to approach more effectively the work that needs to be done in the (near) future and to reach all the deliverables.

The second consortium meeting has also been the occasion to share the conclusions of WP2 on "Historical Peace Treaties and Agreements", and WP3 on "Representations of religious coexistence: past and present". Both WP's had reached the respective milestones and accomplished all their deliverables, though now working further on academic publications.

A discussion on the state of affairs of WP5 "Impact on Education" and the impact of the pandemic on WP5 also had a central place on the agenda of the meeting. This WP is developed in cooperation with schools and sites of informal education in each country where the project operates. Inevitably, it was affected by the lockdowns and restrictions on mobility throughout Europe in the first months of 2020, and remains to be affected by the restrictions to access the schools in the present academic year. In spite of this situation, WP 5 was already able to perform a substantial part of its planned tasks by March 2020. This permits us to be optimistic about reaching the promising outcomes along the line of what has been planned in the Grant Agreement.

The outcomes of WP 2, 3 and 5, serve as an important base for the work of WP6 "Policy impact: education and religious dialogue" and WP 7 on "Dissemination, Exploitation and Communication". The sessions of these two WP's were fruitful to identify key points, make a more concrete plans for the coming months and enhance the cooperation among participants and the effective coordination of these two WPs with WP 2 and 3.

Apart from the sessions devoted to WP2, 3, 5, 6 and 7, a meeting of the steering committee and a session devoted to WP 8 on "Ethics Requirements", with the attendance of 3 members of the ethical board, closed the mid-term meeting.

The unbalanced length of the different sessions' reports responds to the exceptionality caused by the pandemic and its particular impact on the filming of the docutubes. This is the reason why the section devoted to the WP 5 is exceptionally long in order to reflect in detail thorough discussion of all the options and possible outcomes.

## 1. The impact of the COVID-19 in the organization of the second consortium meeting

The meeting, that had been initially planned for the 31st of March - 2nd of April 2020, was re-scheduled and re-organized due to the restrictions derived from the Covid-19 pandemic. For the same reason it took place online on the 16th and 17th of September. The program had to be readjusted due to the

technical and human constrains: on the one hand, a two full day meeting on-line proved to be a complicated format. Moreover, the impact of the lock down and particularly the measures taken by the school systems in all of the countries involved, has had a deep impact in the schedule of the deliverables and therefore, became a central issue on the agenda of the meeting.

In spite of these inconveniences, the aims of this mid-term meeting were accomplished and measures to continue the project and fulfil the deliverables in the current situation were very carefully pondered and established. We can therefore consider that the meeting was successful mainly due to the commitment and good work of all participants.

The cancellation of the meeting in Granada was a difficult decision that was taken in response to the lock down of Spain, only three weeks before the planned on-site meeting. In spite of this, all the local suppliers involved, from the travel agency to hotel and catering supplier accepted the cancelation without charging any penalty to the budget beyond some expenses of the airlines. Initially, we did not discard that it would be possible to meet physically in September. However, by July we realized that the restrictions to fly would make it very hard, if not impossible, for our team members to travel to Spain.

Along these difficult months, there was a close on-line collaboration among WP leaders. The 3rd of April the Steering Committee met to identify the problems caused by the lockdown and find some solutions. There was a close follow up particularly between the Granada team (UGR and Fundea) with the team lead by John Wolffe (Open University) and the company Clear Focus since the lock down had ruined the plan of WP5 to film the work of the focus group in a local school. All these communications between John Wolffe, Gail Block (Clear Focus Productions), Elena Arigita (UGR) and Javier Ruipérez (FUNDEA) were closely followed by Patrick Pasture and Christophe Schellekens.

Other WP7 bi-monthly progress meetings were regularly convened by Michal Choptiany, with the aim of coordinating the strategy of communication. In this regard, an important side effect of the cancelation in Granada was that the public event that had been arranged had to be totally cancelled. Also the planning to film short interviews with participants had to be re-designed and Michal Choptiany together with Alicja Bielak (UniWarsaw) have set up a plan to make short films and written interviews with participants that have been periodically disseminated on the social media.

All in all, the balance of these pandemic months has been ambivalent: on the one hand, the problems caused by the lock down, and particularly the difficulties to re-arrange and continue with the plan in the schools, keeps being troublesome since it is a particularly important outcome upon which other WPs draw their own work. On the other hand, and in spite of all the problems that individually we all have had to face in a greater or a lesser degree, as a consortium we are satisfied that we have been able to maintain a good cooperation in a friendly and empathic environment.

## 2. The on-line meeting

The on-line platform was provided by FUNDEA. Javier Ruipérez was in charge of creating the space with the tool GoToMeet and distributed the instructions to all participants.

Participants were all the researchers of the consortium, including the postdoc researchers whose contract had already expired. Eight members of the advisory board and three members of the ethics boards attended several sessions. Also Jarko Siren, in his capacity as project officer, and Francisco Díez de Velasco and Leila Almazova , as reviewers, followed various moments and full sessions of the meeting.

Participants:

*RETOPEA collaborators and staff*: Riho Altnurme; Alicija Bielak; Michal Choptiany; Bram De Ridder; Irene Dingel; Laura Galian; Lidja Georgieva; Peter Heyrman; Nadia Hindi; Henning Jürgens; Mikko Ketola; Aleksandar Krzalovski; Kaarel Kuurmaa; Madis Maasing; John Maiden; Marija Manasievska; Axel Marx; Pasture Patrick; Antonio Peláez Rovira; Merve Reyhan Kayicci; Maria Dolores Rodríguez Gómez; Priit Rohtmets; Päivi Salmesvuori; Christophe Schellekens; Stefanie Sinclair; Soen Violet; Ivan Stefanovski; Tamara Sztyma; Naum Trajanovski; Ann Trappers; Karel Van Nieuwenhuyse; Welker Arpad; John Wolffe

*Advisory Board*: Martin Liepach; Luz Gomez; Alana Harris; Elizabeth A. Olsen; Mona Siddiqui; Dariusz Stola; Katrien Struyven; Rita Van Nierop; Angelina Vladikova; Johan Vrints; Louise Westmarland

Other: Gail Block (Clear Focus)

EC: Jarkko Siren (PO); Leila Almazova; Francisco Díez de Velasco (external reviewers)

Agenda for the first day

9h30 CET

Opening and welcome by project leader Elena Arigita and Patrick Pasture

10h00-11h00 CET

Sessions WP 3 (Representations of religious coexistence: past and present)

Discussion edited volume (Riho Altnurme, Elena Arigita and Patrick Pasture, eds, *Religious Diversity in Europe: Mediating the Past to the Young*, Bloomsbury)

Chapter 1. Religious Diversity in Europe: The Challenges of Past and Present by Patrick Pasture and Christophe Schellekens

Chapter 8. The Semantics of Religious Pluralism in the Islamic Tradition in Late al-Andalus and in Contemporary Islamic Transnationalism by Nadia Hindi, Mª Dolores Rodríguez Gómez and Antonio Peláez Rovira (University of Granada)

Chapter 4. The Politics of Representing Minorities in Europe's Museums, by Marija Manasievska (Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje); Merve Reyhan Kayikci (University of Granada), Tamara Sztyma-Knasiecka (University of Warsaw) and Naum Trajanovski (Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje)

11h00-11h15 CET: Break

11h15-13h00 CET

Chapter 2. Views of the Young: Reflections on the Basis of European Pilot Studies by John Maiden (Open University); Stefanie Sinclair (Open University); Päivi Salmesvuori (University of Helsinki); Karel van Nieuwenhuyse (KU Leuven) and John Wolffe (Open University)

Chapter 3. Representing European Religious Diversity in Textbooks, by Madis Maasing (University of Tartu) and Karel van Nieuwenhuyse (KU Leuven)

Chapter 5. Religious Diversity in Popular Culture by Mikko Ketola (University of Helsinki), Ivan Stefanovski (Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Skopje) and Kaarel Kuurmaa (University of Tartu)

Chapter 6. Migration and the Politics of Memory: Political Discourses of Religious Toleration and Peace by Laura Galian (University of Granada), John Maiden (Open University), Stefanie Sinclair (Open University), and Árpád Welker (University of Helsinki)

13h00-14h00 Lunch break

14h00-15h45 CET: WP 3 (continued)

Chapter 7. Memory Regimes and Commemorative Practices of the Good Friday Agreement (1998) and the Ohrid Framework Agreement (2001) by Lidija Georgieva (Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje), Naum Trajanovski (Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje) and John Wolffe (Open University)

Chapter 9. European Interfaith Collaboration by Priit Rohtmets (University of Tartu)

Chapter 10. Religious tolerance in the new spirituality subculture. The Estonian case by Lea Altnurme (University of Tartu)

15h45-16h CET: Break

16h-17h00 CET: WP 2 (historical research) Summary presentation (30 min) by Henning P. Jürgens of the WP's final outcomes and links with other projects (RESILIENCE, Religious Peace Project IEG).

30 min discussion and exchange with WP 6

17h-18h: WP 7 (communication, dissemination and exploitation) Presentation of recent outreach actions and future plans (30 min) followed by 30 min discussion.

In his welcoming words, PL Patrick Pasture expressed his appreciation for the work and engagement of all collaborators, who almost all attended the meeting and agreed to further contribute to produce academic outcomes of the project and publish their results. He also drew attention to the challenges created by the still ongoing pandemic, which not only made that we cannot meet in person in the wonderful – and for the project particularly symbolic – city of Granada, but seriously hampers the project, in particular the development of the docutubes. Indeed, since March the possibilities to try out the making of docutubes have been closed. In addition, the pandemic also puts a heavy burden on all academics because of additional stress and adaptations in teaching. But he also emphasizes the enthusiasm of all to continue the project, because we are all consider it of utmost importance in these times of intense polarization and are, to be honest, passionate about it.

### *2.1.1. WP 3 on Representations of religious coexistence: past and present*

The morning and afternoon of the first day were devoted to the coordination of the book *Religious Diversity in Europe: Mediating the Past to the Young*, edited by Riho Altnurme, Elena Arigita and Patrick Pasture, ed. Bloomsbury, 2021. This volume will constitute the main academic result of the research carried out by all participant researchers involved in WP 3, including the scientific coordination.

The book assesses how religious diversities in past and present are (re)presented in a wide variety of cultural contexts, particularly (though not exclusively) to teenagers: in textbooks, in museums and exhibitions; in popular (youth) culture, especially in TV series and online sources, as well as in political speech and in movements and places focusing on interfaith encounters. It will be promoted alongside the 'docutubes' produced by teenagers to stimulate religious literacy, tolerance and critical thinking among teenagers, that could be used in formal as well as informal educational settings. Its targets are an academic public alongside professionals (teachers, educators, museum curators, social workers, religious leaders, etc.). In addition, the RETOPEA website/platform will contain extensive visual 'clippings' destined to be used for making docutubes, but they are relevant for this book as well. It will run for several years after completion of the project.

The book can be described as inter- or even trans-disciplinary. Most chapters are co-authored by members of different institutions, with different disciplinary backgrounds and perspectives. Therefore a good coordination and dialogue among authors is crucial for the success of the final result.

The sessions were designed precisely to evaluate the first drafts, detect possible problems, and provide comments to the author. Everyone in the room had read at least two chapters different to theirs, and editors encouraged the authors to read all of them after the meeting in order to avoid overlapping and introduce connections when appropriated and the necessary coherence. The dynamic of the chapter's presentation was as follows: a member of the team introduced the chapter in 5 min. and then there was 15 min. of discussion.

The result of this dynamic was productive for all authors. The editors encouraged the authors to continue the discussion after the meeting when necessary to give coherence to the final version of the book. Two chapters were not presented in the session, the one commissioned to Lea Altnurme (whose text is almost finished) and Chapter 9 on European Interfaith Collaboration by Priit Rohtmets (University of Tartu). As even a draft was missing the editors will follow up after the meeting.

### *2.1.2. WP 2 Historical Peace Treaties and Agreements*

Henning P. Jürgens presented the WP's final outcomes and links with other projects.

Four deliverables were achieved, of which the last one was submitted on April 30th, 2020. The main "products" of the WP are the clippings and reports. A collection of links to online available information on the treaties, original versions etc has been submitted as deliverable 2.4.

The corpus of 21 treaties generated 202 clippings that are compounded by visual and textual material, enhanced with contextual information, metadata, topical focus points and guiding questions (Deliverable 2.2.). The cooperation with WP 4 and 7 has made all this available on the RETOPEA website/platform.

Other outcomes are 21 reports on the corpus of the treaties that provide background information for teachers/supervisors working with teenagers (deliverable 2.3). The reports (of 5 to 6 pages long) show thematic connections between diverse topics, apply historic questions to contemporary situations and allow for long-time perspectives and comparison.

The reports allow for long-term comparison and some considerations that were summarized as follows and serve as a general frame for elaborating the recommendations for the work of WP6:

- Universal aspiration vs. local and temporal circumscribed.
- Top-down vs. bottom-up development and implementation.
- Focus on the role of individuals vs. focus on collective bodies.
- Number of parties involved: regulations between two or more confessions, two or more different religions and with general aspiration.
- Western and non-Western traditions.
- Church/Religion and State/Politics relationship.
- Importance for today's readers: they constitute today official documents, but also religious texts, they are the basis for historical memory, are contested etc.

Apart from that, 7 conference papers were prepared for international conferences, of which two suspended due to the pandemic.

In the near future the members of this panel/WP will attend the conferences that were re-scheduled and will work on new academic publications. The IEG will integrate the results of WP 2 in a publication together with the papers of a conference (which will also allow for further discussions) on *Religionsfrieden im Kontext des frühneuzeitlichen Europa*, on 17-20 February 2021. The results will also be integrated in n upcoming monograph by Patrick Pasture *A History of Christendom: Church, State and Religious Freedom in the West* (contracted with Bloomsbury).

The work on this WP has opened new venues for research on this line started by RETOPEA. The Leibniz Institute for European Research (IEG) has initiated a long term research and edition project (Europäische Religionsfrieden Digital (EURED), funded by the German Union of Academies of Sciences. It starts in October 2020 and is estimated to continue until 2040 with an international kick-off conference that will be attended by several members of the RETOPEA project.

There is in fact an ongoing collaboration with the consortium partners and WP's to produce more academic publications, to further improve the web presentation of clippings and reports, to contribute to WP6 with recommendations and be involved on the social media strategy designed by WP7. The

team members of WP2 will also organize and take part of the process to film the docutubes with a student group.

For the near future, some members of this WP will collaborate with ReIReS- Research Infrastructures for Religious Studies, also funded by the European Commission and in the application of an ambitious new program RESILIENCE-Religious Studies Infrastructure: tooLs, Innovation, Experts, conNections and Centres in Europe that will have some connections with RETOPEA. Other contacts are ongoing with partners in Poland.

*After the presentations of WP 2 and 3, the discussion focused on how to translate all the academic knowledge provided to WP 6 that works on the dissemination through policy papers. This issue is reported below, sub 2.2.4.*

### *2.1.3. WP 7 on Communication, dissemination and exploitation*

Alicja Bielak introduced some reflections on the impact of the communication strategy based on the statistics available. Some modifications in the visual communication have been made in order to make the website and other online outlets more attractive and an important effort has been made to increase the visibility in the social media in the last months.

Twitter seems to be the most effective social media for the project. The statistics show an increasing number of followers up to the double of visits after the uploading of the clippings up.

Facebook is the second most important social medium because many members of the project are users of this portal and are effectively sharing with their contacts all the posts produced.

Instagram, being the preferred social medium of the young, is the most difficult medium for RETOPEA. The configuration of Instagram is preferred/designed for the visual material, and since we work often with texts, it makes it challenging to produce materials for this particular portal. However, WP 7 works to adapt the contents to the characteristics of each outlet

During the last months, the members of the consortium have produced at home a series of short videos for the initiative “Faces of RETOPEA” and also short written interviews. Another initiative is the “Clipping of the Week”, uploaded on Thursdays. All of them are materials to maintain the interest of the followers in the different social media and are uploaded weekly.

Additionally, an initiative for a halfway celebration of the project has been promoted and researchers of WP2 and 3 have elaborated short interviews to reflect on the aims of the project, the work done and the perspectives for the future.

All of these interventions in the social media have replaced somehow the plan for filming that had been established with the occasion of the mid-term meeting in Granada and that had been planned to produce short interviews at several different scenarios of the city with members of the consortium and also edited pieces of the planned public event at FUNDEA. All in all, the new strategy developed by WP 7 has been successful and will be enhanced with its continuity in the following months with more interviews of the other team members.

The plan for the coming months, as explained by WP 7 leader Michal Choptiany, is to continue with the series "Faces of Retopea" and "Clipping of the Week" in the social media. For the coming months, the focus will be on the work and output of the WP 6 activities.

The website www.retopea.eu is regularly updated with the information that all members of the consortium send to Alicja about their own academic activity that, together with the sections of clippings and reports, make the website more attractive and active.

The focus in the next months will be at reaching out at the specific audiences, and particularly the educators, to disseminate the clippings, reports and materials prepared for the docutubes. For this purpose, the clippings database will be promoted at scientific, educational and religious portals such as H-Net, EUROCLIO, EFTRE (European Forum for Teachers of Religious Education), EADH (European Association for Digital Humanities) among others.

Another aim for the near and medium future is to reach out to the local historical magazines addressed to a wide public that might reach teenagers and educators with the aim of publishing materials adapted to this type of wide audience to disseminate the outputs of the project.

The internal communication across the WPs will continue to have the support of the bi-weekly Internal Bulletin and the support to the team members in their individual activities related to the project, among which the promotion of the forthcoming volume of studies of WP 3.

### 2.2. 17 September

The second day of the mid-term meeting focused on the WP 5 on Education and on WP 8 on Ethical issues. Since WP 5 has been directly affected by the pandemic restrictions, the second day (including the steering committee meeting) was largely devoted to evaluate the situation and take decisions on how to carry on the project given the severe limitations and restrictions, which may still hamper the project for many more months.

| Agenda for the second day |
| --- |
| 9h30-11h CET: Session WP 5 (Impact on education): Presentation (including film), explanation and discussion of the docutubes process. Proposal for way ahead under COVID-19 constraints |
| 11h-11h15 CET: Break |
| 11h15-13h CET: WP 5 (continued) |

13h-14h CET: Lunch
14h-16:15h CET: Steering committee (PI's only)
16h15-16h30 CET: Break
16h30-17h30 CET: Session WP 8: Ethical issues, with the Ethical Board
17h30-18h30 CET: Session WP 6: Policy impact: education and religious dialogue – Setting up a strategy

### *2.2.1. WP 5 Impact on Education*

This session was devoted to the findings of the focus group workshops and the process of filming the docutubes. The team in charge of WP 5 had already started filming in several settings before March and the preliminary outputs shown during the morning make the consortium confident that it will be possible to accomplish the committed deliverables. Last but not least, the commitment of subcontractor Clear Focus with the project and particularly the solutions provided and the availability of Clear Focus producer Gail Block was remarkable and much appreciated.

A further discussion among participants in the first experiences on what worked well and how to refine the process was very important for all other members to consider how to improve the future workshops in the different settings.

- The focus groups

John Maiden made an introduction of the work done in the focus groups. The team visited four schools in the UK with a total of six sessions, two in Germany, one in Estonia and one in Spain and one school in Finland. In addition to that, they worked with an older group in Macedonia (18 years old or more), and also another group in Belgium of postgraduate students of the teacher training program of the department of history at KU Leuven. The findings of this work will constitute the basis of the chapter "Views of the Young: Reflections on the Basis of European Pilot Studies" of the book of WP 3 *Religious Diversity in Europe* and D 5.1.

The semi-structured focus groups phase began with a questionnaire about how the teenagers understand what religious diversity means and looks like for them, and what their main sources of information were. This opened the floor for the further discussion. The following quotations summarize some key conclusions:

> "The focus groups revealed that most participating young people did not have much knowledge and understanding of religious diversity in the past. On the other hand, nevertheless, they hold a clear and critical thoughts and opinions about religious diversity in the present. These do not really seem to be informed by their knowledge of religious diversity in the past. The opposite is rather true, it appears that many participating young people "back-project" their knowledge and opinions of religious diversity in the present, on to the past. And

in so doing, they combine this with a genuine presentist attitude meaning that they hold the assumption that in the past, things were 'by definition' worst.

It thus seems that experiences with very biased, one-sided and stereotypical representations of religion and religious people (in particular Islam and Muslims) in the media today, bear the potential to enable young people to identify and deconstruct the same mechanisms in (secondary) historical sources."

The focus group workshops suggest a number of opportunities and challenges in terms of engaging young people with the process of making the docutubes. The discussion provided a space for open discussion, for exploring experiences of other young people. It was also an opportunity to explore religious diversity in either the local context or other national contexts. They also showed an enthusiasm for creative and technological aspects and familiarity with technology.

As challenges, they lack of historical understanding, therefore it was important to contextualize quite slowly the clippings and this takes time. Secondly, addressing this question of presentism, again the docutubes workshop will require a lot of work on behalf of the other previous sessions.

- The docutubes.

Gail Block presented an example of a docutube produced in Leuven by a small group of students. These students all held a MA in History and followed the special teacher training programme in History Education. After the viewing Gail summarized some impressions compiled from the students. According to their comments, the most used word was "inspiring", they loved the clippings and enjoyed engaging in the process. They found that this was a pedagogy that promoted creativity and critical thinking, and considered it a method that they would potentially use in their future experience in the classroom. The expression that summarizes the experience is that it was "learning by doing".

However, the students felt the editing of the material and the planning of the filming to be very demanding and time consuming. Young people are skilled consumers of IT, but they are not creators with technology, and this is the part that they considered perhaps a bit too demanding. Gail commented that this process may be simplified and different solutions can be offered.

As overall challenges for the coming docutube workshops, there are a number of issues to consider:

- Time allocation.
- Getting the balance between learning about peace and religious toleration *vs.* technical demands of film-making not only for the students but also for the teachers who will need support.
- Managing the disillusionment when learners find their work does not look like work of professionals ("pedagogy of despair").

- Problem of translating abstract ideas into concrete filmable subjects: How to make films about ideas you can't point a camera at (eg: abstract ideas such as free speech).
- Essentially a face-to-face pedagogy *vs.* the implication of COVID-19 restrictions.

Beyond the technical solutions to make the process more attractive and less complex technically, it was suggested that we could provide participants in the workshops, students and also teachers, with a letter informing in detail about the collaboration with RETOPEA: the aims, hours and skills achieved in the process.

- Where to go in the light of the COVID-19 restrictions? Ways forward

John Wolffe, the WP5 leader, provided an overview of where the WP stands and conducted the discussion with the aim of finding solutions to overcome the constrains caused by the sanitary restrictions.

The realistic situation is to assume that the pandemic restrictions will continue until Spring 2021. Schools are expected to continue but with ongoing disruption and restrictions on visitors. Furthermore, the Open University team would be unable to travel outside the UK until April 2021, because of quarantine conditions, insurance restrictions and risk of stranding. All in all, under current exceptional circumstances, the deliverables dates have and can be adjusted bearing in mind the overall project timeline.

The situation for possible upcoming workshops in the coming months is as follow:

- Green School, London proposed November-December 2020, but it is subject to review and possible constraints on visitors.

- Le Foyer proposed an activity before the end of 2020. Since the UK rules require travelers from Belgium to self-isolate for 14 days, it means the OU team could not attend in person. Karel Van Nieuwenhuyse may be available to attend instead. Ann Trappers observes that it could be an intensive programme, scheduled for the Fall holidays in early November. It needs to be planned in advance, and good internet connection is also needed to permit the intervention of the OU team.

- Tampere, Finland, proposed December 2020 but does not currently admit non-resident foreign nationals and the school does not allow visitors so all support (including from the Helsinki team) would have to be remote.

- Tartu proposed January or February 2021. Estonia currently requires UK nationals to self-isolated for a minimum of 7 days so in person participation by OU team is impracticable.

- Warsaw is under discussion. It would be possible to arrange a plan to coincide with the RETOPEA meeting in spring 2020 in hopes of in person participation by OU team.

- In Macedonia the group is slightly different because the age is older. The situation will be examined in the coming weeks because the beginning of the academic year has been postponed and it is yet unclear that if the teaching will be on line or in person.

- Granada had a very good experience with the focus groups but the current situation is very uncertain. For the moment, the general impression is that it is not allowed the access to the school. There are other options with informal education sites that need to be evaluated.

- In Germany the situation is similar to that of Spain. The only possibility would be to try to find volunteers and do it outside of the schools.

All in all, at the moment of the mid-term meeting it was not possible to have certainty about the possible scenarios in the coming months. The schedule remains uncertain as well as the possibility of cancelation of workshops in a short term. However, the docutubes are the core of the project and many other activities depend directly on them. A number of options have been considered and are summarizes as follows:

An option is that the OU team participate remotely, providing prior briefing to partners and participants, online session during workshop to address questions and gather feedback. It is also possible to organize online sessions with teachers and youth leaders. This would imply more work for the local teams who should supervise the online sessions to avoid possible misconduct with the filmed material in order to maintain the ethical standards. Clear Focus also offered the possibility to give online formation to the local teams to be able to produce the docutubes and provide the materials that could be sent to the local teams.

Another possibility is to arrange new focus groups with young university students , what means moving on from the aims of our initial plan and or to settle for filming entirely in the UK (apart from existing footage from Leuven).

All these options remained open for the discussion of the steering committee. Betsy Olson, member of the Advisory Board and very experienced with filming for academic research, observed that there is already a lot of remote conversations and activities going on with young people, who are also much more familiar with it than we, adults, are. Hence she encouraged the team to move to safe platforms for remote participation. In her opinion, doing so would not alter the product significantly ; in addition there is nothing wrong, quite the contrary, with having several different formats, which also reflect this moment of an exceptional time.

In all cases, the adaptation requires a careful revision of the ethical issues that in the present conditions might need important reformulations in order to accomplish not only the ethical requirements but also to strictly adjust to the current sanitary restrictions and national or regional protocols.

All these scenario's assume that the running time of the WP will not be prolonged and that tasks and deliverables may be shifted only to a limited extent in function of the practical restrictions. The original plans and intents of the WP as stated in the grant agreement remain in place.

Steering committee

After the discussion of WP 5 the Steering Committee met and made some important conclusions:

The SC observed that in the current conditions it will not be possible to complete the docutubes within the time schedule outlined in the GA. An extension of the project with several months, however, is not possible for the different partners. Therefore it is decided to move all activities, in particular related to WP 6, that do not entirely depend on the experiences with making the docutubes, to earlier times. In this respect also the making of the Badged Open Course should be done as much as possible before or in parallel with the docutubes.

As regards the production of the docutubes it is understood that their finalization will be postponed to the very end of the project. The original format will be followed as much as possible, although online pilots are not excluded. However, it is advised to look for more informal settings (in line with the original set up of the project). Given the time needed to make docutubes, that will be the necessary anyway.

It means that outreach activities, including policy recommendations, that rely on the experiences with the docutubes, will be scheduled at the very end of the project.

If an extension of the project for a short period of 2-3 months is necessary, will be decided later. In principle we aim at concluding the project by 30 April 2022 as foreseen.

### *2.2.3 WP 8 Ethical Issues*

This session was of capital importance to continue the discussion opened by the situation of WP 5 and the ethical implications of adapting the focus groups and the production of the docutubes. This is why it was also very valuable to have Louise Westmarland, Alana Harris and Katrien Struyven attending this session.

One of the possibilities to move ahead is to hold some talks and focus group discussions online (not the making of docutubes), and to involve university students as well. The discussion with Louise Westmarland, Alana Harris and Katrien Struyven reveals a large consensus that such online are possible and even may have positive features. The experience of Alana Harris and Ann trappers in particular suggests that online conversations are actually safe and in general are not problematic. There are nevertheless a few issues that need to be considered. These conversations must ensure a safe environment in which the teenagers are free to speak out, but in which it is clear how to avoid and deal with possible unwanted interventions and infringements on etiquette, in particular signs of radicalization. In this respect it is essential that these conversations are organized and monitored by a professional who can resolve problems if they arise. This professional should best be a local teacher, educator or team member of the project; a OU researcher may come in to wrap up conclusions and have a final talk, but should not be in charge of the whole session. It is also important to establish if the conversation would be recorded – audiotape raises less concerns that videotape – and if so who will

have access and how and will be safeguarded. The conversation should also be safe – using a safe platform, password protected – to avoid external intrusions. Transparent communication towards teenagers and parents is essential. These concerns require an amendment to the consent procedures. OU will formulate such an amendment, which will then first be submitted to the Ethical Board, before submitting it to the OU Ethical Committee and the KU Leuven SMEC, after which they will be submitted to all local ethical committees for confirmation.

Stefanie Sinclair signals that OU has also updated the questions for post-workshop evaluation. This questionnaire should also follow the same procedure.

### *2.2.4. WP 6 Policy impact: education and religious dialogue*

Lidija Georgieva, as PI and leader of the WP introduced this session recalling the issues already tackled in the previous sessions.

She expressed her concern with the delay of WP 5 and the uncertainty that the pandemic restrictions impose on the work with the schools and informal education sites. This WP on policy impact heavily relies on WP5.

However, WP 2 and especially WP 3 have already lead to some relevant conclusions and recommendations (see D 3.3-3.6 and 3.7). Something that was initially not much anticipated is that these conclusions and recommendations would be particularly relevant for cultural policy, in particular regarding the representation of religious coexistence in museums and other cultural venues. After the session devoted to the book chapters, Lidija observed that the results were extremely useful to further develop the policy recommendations, both for education and religious dialogue. *It is decided that there will be further consultation between Lidija and WP 3 (particularly with Mikko Ketola) about the conclusions and recommendations to make them more useable to propose and discuss them with policy makers*.

The main issue is the strategy of proceeding with the activities that can be done in the current conditions and postpone those that depend on WP 5. *In this respect it was decided to prioritize the activities that do not depend on the results of WP 5* (with the exception of conclusions on the basis of the pilot studies).

Finally, the list of institutions to address the policy papers is ready and will be circulated among members of the consortium. In this regard

Regarding the database or data collection, that Lidjia Georgieva did not know how to manage, Peter Heyrman, from WP 4, stated that such a resource can be developed in an effective way that wouldn't suppose too much work.