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1.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project outline and objectives

The School Parliament is a project implemented in 2009 in Angola by SFCG in partnership with IASED (Instituto Angola de Sistemas Eleitorais e Democracia). Originally created with the aim of promoting greater positive and constructive youth interaction in the democratic process within the country, the project also educates young people about the practices and principles of democracy and creates a safe forum for dialogue between authorities and young parliamentarians on issues of governance, human rights, and electoral processes. The School Parliament was the stepping stone for the creation of the Youth Conflict Resolution Centers, a project funded by BP-Angola to support youth as actors in peace building and community engagement. The project capitalizes on the lessons learned and experiences from previous projects to continue promoting youth development while empowering youth to take ownership of their community level initiatives.

The target group is composed of young students between 15 and 25 years of age, attending the last two years of high-school. The students with the best academic standings were elected, and in some cases selected, by their peers, teachers and school directors (in turn designated by the Provincial Administration for Education), as representatives of their respective schools and acting deputies of the school parliament body. Currently, ten schools from all the municipalities in Luanda and five schools from Cabinda, (for a total of 75 students) are included in the project.

The following points are a summary of the main key findings:

- As opposed to the data gathered from the Youth Conflict Resolution Centers case study that revealed a low female participation within the school associations, the majority of the student parliament deputies present during the survey of the School Parliament case study were female (60%).

- A high percentage of the student parliament deputies demonstrated considerable understanding of governance, human rights, and electoral processes concepts relayed during the project.

- The perception of level of participation of the student parliament deputies was considered adequate according to the number of students who participated in the school parliament activities (60%).

- An important number of school deputies are of the opinion that the school parliament deputies were elected through a democratic process (47%) and also felt that the executive team of the parliament was chosen in a transparent and democratic manner.

- The majority of the student deputies were able to attend regular exchanges to identify the challenges faced by the youth communities.

- The self assessment provided by the student deputies regarding their ability to interact with the local authorities was reported to be “good”

---

1 See Annex: Graphs “Gender Distribution”
The majority of the **students showed interest in the continuation of the project**, but have recommended a new approach to the thematic proposed.

The majority of the **student deputies reported that the project and activities had not received very much visibility**

*(See Annex: Graphs for the corresponding data)*

One of the main focus of this case study (just as the Youth Conflict Resolution Centers case study) is to observe the participation of women amongst the school parliament as well as their active interaction within it. Also, in order to ensure comparability between the data gathered from the Youth Conflict Resolution Centers case study, the gender section should have been incorporated in the questionnaire. As it was observed in the YCRC case study, gender disparity is a main issue affecting the local communities, making this a relevant factor to extrapolate and compare from the two studies.

### 2. PROJECT OUTLINE

The School Parliament project is based on a previous venture that Search for Common Ground introduced in Burundi in 2005. The organization adapted the project to fit the Angolan context in 2009, stressing the importance of citizen’s participation so that the needs and voices of the targeted groups are represented in the national government. After Angola's elections in 2008, which resulted in a crushing victory for the still ruling party MPLA, a new governmental approach was adopted, which included new reforms and increased dialogue between the government, civil society, and civilian representation. According to recent studies implemented by SFCG, however, young Angolans see these past elections as a quick road to change without giving the due consideration to the political and structural realities present throughout the country².

SFCG has expanded the School Parliament (financed by the European Union) project to include "conflict resolution centers" in local schools and mobilizing the school deputies to also serve as mediators and mentors amongst their peers, thus facilitating a cross fertilization process between the different groups, such as school parliament and school associations, of the lessons learned and past experiences.

During the implementation of the School Parliament project, SFCG has worked with 50 high-school students acting as “parliament deputies” and representing the schools of the 10 municipalities that make up Luanda province. Student deputies have been meeting monthly to debate current issues concerning their schools and local communities and make policy decisions accordingly. Since the project started, SFCG has organized school parliament preparatory meetings for students, convened a school parliament forum, and held parliamentary commission sessions.

The School Parliament project includes the following activities:

- **Media**: SFCG has used its weekly radio project “Baza Madie” to provide information on democracy, governance, and participation to a broader youth audience beyond the student participants in Luanda. The project spotlights different emerging themes in the projects, sharing them with young people of diverse backgrounds across Luanda. In addition, School Parliament

² *Survey “Perception of Local Authorities from the General Population”, SFCG Angola, January 2012*
students were featured during a live broadcast on TV Zimbo, the second biggest Angolan TV channel, viewed by millions of people.

- **Cooperation with local and national government authorities:** The project has also involved local and national government authorities, in order to give the students the opportunity to become familiar with the structures and functions of these governmental bodies. This strategy is intended to show that when people with different perspectives work together, good governance is not only promoted, but enhanced.

- **Exchanges:** Although this is more of an outcome of the project than an activity, SFCG is looking to expand the project through youth exchanges with more established programs. The National Infantile Parliament from Guinea-Bissau took part in an exchange with Angola so that Youth Parliamentarians from both countries had an opportunity to share best practices and approaches.

More specifically the project objectives can be summarized by the following:

(Notice on indicators): Some of the indicators for this part of the case study refer to a qualitative feedback from the student deputies. The purpose of the case study is to have an initial assessment of the change in perception and interaction between the deputies and their government counterparts, as well as to assess their level of comprehension of the material covered throughout the project. With that in mind, even though the main structure of the survey was designed for a quantitative analysis, some of the questions are of qualitative nature, as some of the information gathered from the student deputies is based on opinion, perception and personal assessment

- Educate Angolan high-school youth within the targeted schools on the concepts regarding active citizenry, principles of democracy, collaboration, governmental roles and accountability
  - **Indicator:** Quality of the responses given by the student deputies to the questionnaire regarding the active citizenry and basic principles of democracy

- Maintain and expand dialogue and interaction between students of Cabinda and Luanda
  - **Indicator:** Perception of the student deputies with regards to the quality of their interaction with their Cabindan counterparts

- Create a space for dialogue and interaction within the Angolan government and school parliament that will allow for exchanges and contributions on key topics that directly affect the youth including human rights, constitutional reform, the electoral process and any other legislative process of the National Assembly
  - **Indicator:** Responses given by the student deputies to the questionnaire showing their perception and overall opinion concerning accessibility and quality of dialogue with local institutions
The overall aim of this case study can be represented by the following diagram

3. METHODOLOGY AND IMPORTANCE OF THE SURVEY

The case study has focused solely on the gathering and analysis of data from the surveys administered to the student parliament deputies who attended the activity. The survey has been chosen and tailored to measure the level of understanding and retention of the notions provided throughout the project, such as active citizenry and principles of democracy, as well as to easily identify any potential oversights in the implementation of the activities through the use of quantitative analysis. The analysis of this data also allowed for the production of graphs, to give a visual representation of the findings.

a. Methodology
Student deputies from the school parliament were invited to take part in the survey, and were gathered in the IMIL high-school for the duration of the activity. The survey itself was handed out individually to each attendant, and was composed of 25 questions, of which 23 were multiple-choice, with one open-ended question and a last question asking the students for further recommendations on the future of the school parliament project.

b. Definitions

Democracy: A system involving multiparty elections, representative government, and freedom of speech.

Active citizenship: Members of nation-states have certain roles and responsibilities to society, although those members may not have specific governing roles.
4. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The initial finding of the survey pertains to the relation between male and female attendees during the implementation of the survey total number of participants 27:

- Female 60%
- Male 40%

With relevance to the technical concepts covered throughout the project that were understood and retained by the school parliament deputies, the key findings showed the following:

- 93% of the deputies had a clear perception of what a school parliament is and replied “Students representing their schools”;
- The majority of deputies were able to identify the meaning of democracy (53%), whilst the remaining 43% perceived democracy as “Freedom of speech”;
- 47% were able to identify good governance as Transparency, Government accountability and active citizen participation to decision-making processes; the remaining percentage has not yet been able to clearly identify these concepts;
- 33% found that they had better understanding of the concepts of democracy and governance after participating to the project;

The deputies surveyed had a good understanding of what the school parliament and its function is, but other concepts related to democracy and good governance need to be further adapted into the manuals developed by SFCG. However, it is important to note that, considering the difficult access to didactic material, outdated school curriculums and politicized educational environments, the seemingly low percentage of students who were able to successfully indentify good governance as Transparency, Government accountability and active citizen participation to decision-making processes, should be taken as a positive outcome of the project, as before the implementation of the project, the school deputies had never been part of a workshop focused on these themes.

To the questions pertaining to the deputies’ interaction with the school parliament, local institutions and activities carried out, the key findings showed the following:

- 53% of the deputies replied to have received resolution texts with enough timing before the parliament’s plenary sessions;
- 67% agreed to have been informed on time regarding school parliament activities;
• 67% admitted that the main challenges faced by the school parliament were the students themselves. 13% found it difficult to align with the schedule of parliament activities;
• 60% found that the level of participation and engagement from school parliament deputies was normal, 27% low and 13% very active;
• 47% of the deputies replied that the school parliamentarians were elected through a democratic process, whilst 33% answered the deputies were nominated by their respective school directors and 13% answered that an ad-hoc selection was administered by the students themselves;
• 60% found that the parliamentarians would frequently hold regular exchanges to identify topics relevant to youth;
• 47% found that all selected topics of the parliament sessions were voted and passed into resolutions, whilst 47% agreed that only some of the topics and activities were passed, and the remaining 6% replied negatively;
• 73% of the deputies agreed on the fact that the executive team of the parliament was chosen in a transparent and democratic manner. The remaining 27% had no specific opinion to offer;
• 87% found that their capacity to interact with local authorities after their experience with the school parliament was good, 13% admitted that their ability was normal;

The above results indicate that the majority of the deputies surveyed found the level of interaction with the school parliament, local institutions and activities carried out, to have changed positively and more in favor of the concepts related to this part of the material covered in the project.

With relevance to project specific topics and issues regarding logistics and project visibility, the key findings showed the following:

• With regards to the interaction between the deputies and the SFCG staff, 80% were satisfied;
• All of the students found that SFCG staff were always on time for activities;
• Concerning the communication between SFCG and the deputies, 93% were satisfied, with the remaining 7% who replied negatively;
• 87% of the deputies received enough documentation throughout the implementation project;
• 40% of the deputies found the quality of logistics provided by SFCG to be excellent, 40% good, 20% normal;
• 53% found that the transportation reimbursement was enough. The remainder felt that the transportation stipend should be higher due to the elevated costs of transportation in the capital city and due to the distance from their homes to the project location
• 80% answered that IASED’s participation as project partner was beneficial to the deputies, whilst 20% found it irrelevant;
• With regards to the deputies’ expectation of the project’s future, 53% thought the project should continue but with a fresher orientation, while 47% recommended that new schools be included;
• 33% confirmed that they had occasionally been able to participate to radio programs produced for the school parliament project, 27% replied never, 20% regularly and 20% irregularly;
• When asked if the deputies had the opportunity to listen to radio programs aired for the visibility of the project, 60% replied yes, 27% no due to time constraints;
Regarding the general visibility of the project, 40% of the deputies replied that the project had no visibility, 33% answered yes but SFCG could have increased project visibility and 27% replied that the project only received partial visibility;

According to the results gathered, the majority of the students were satisfied with the overall quality of the logistics and interaction with the SFCG-Angola staff members. In terms of project visibility, the majority of the student deputies (40%) felt that the project received no visibility. Interestingly however, the majority of the deputies also reported that they only occasionally or never participated in radio programs produced for the school parliament project.

Lastly, the school parliament deputies were asked to give their recommendations on the future aspects of the project and the key findings showed the following:

- 27% asked for an expansion of the project
- 20% advised for more radio production
- 20% recommended better logistics
- 20% thought the project needed a diversification of activities
- 7% felt there should be better communication between SFCG and students

5. DATA ANALYSIS AND CORRELATIONS

Interestingly, unlike the second phase of the project involving the Youth Conflict Resolution Centers, the School Parliament phase provided encouraging data regarding participation of female students to the survey (60% females) and more generally in the parliament itself. As evidence to this, the deputies present during the implementation of the survey confirmed that the majority of the parliamentarians representing their schools were in fact females.

Further analysis of the differences between the male and female deputies shows an evident disparity in the level of participation and engagement of the school parliament deputies, as seen in question 12. Additional investigation of the question shows that the majority of the deputies that answered very active, with regards to the level of participation of the school parliament deputies, were female. The same trend can be found for those who answered “normal”, whilst most of the deputies who answered “low” were males.

From the answers provided to the questions regarding the technical knowledge retained by the deputies, the results show that the vast majority of the students present during the survey were able to correctly identify the relevant concepts pertaining to active citizenry, governance, and democratic principles imparted throughout the project. This is supported by the answers given to question two; in particular the 33% of the deputies who replied to have obtained a better understanding of democratic principles and governance, as well as the 27% of the deputies who agreed to have a better comprehension of the National Assembly.

---

3 See Annex: Graph 1 “Perception of the school parliament”
4 See Annex: Graph 2 “Benefits of the school parliament”
These results can be correlated and crosschecked with the answers provided to question 3, regarding the definition of democracy. 53% of the deputies identified democracy as “Rights and obligations of citizens”\(^5\). The same can also be done with question 13, with regards to the principles of democratic process and the answers provided to the question concerning the method of selection of school parliamentarians, as 47% of the deputies answered that the representatives were elected through a democratic process\(^6\). This is confirmed by the answers given to question 16, as 73% of the deputies regarded the selection of the executive team of the parliament transparent and democratic\(^7\).

Lastly, with regards to the question pertaining to the relevant knowledge gained by the deputies, it is possible to observe another correlation between the answers given to question 17\(^8\). The majority of the deputies (87%) confirmed that their capacity to interact with local authorities had improved since the beginning of the project. This is supported by the answers given to question 2, as 33% answered “Better understanding of democratic concepts and governance”.

### 6. RECOMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made for the project and the improvement of the activities implemented:

a) **Careful timing should be considered for the implementation of future similar projects that deal primarily with youth and especially high-school students.** The reason for this has been observed during the often disruptive effect of politically related activities, such as the electoral campaign of 2012 that took place in Angola, that forcefully alter the schools schedules, and therefore the students’ participation to project related activities which impedes their attendance. The specific political activities and their impact on the local communities are, however, not the main focus of this case study. Therefore, any correlation between these activities and student participation to the project is only a product of observation, unrelated to the focus of the case study.

b) **Provide more visibility to the project particularly at the community level.** As shown by the answers provided by the school deputies regarding project visibility, future implementations should employ a more thorough visibility strategy and/or encourage the school deputies to organize more activities that spread the notions provided by SFCG, therefore amplifying the project’s expected results.

c) **Include more schools and deputies from the Luanda province.** This recommendation was brought forward by the school deputies themselves; a wider sampling of students would ensure a more extensive gathering of data, and wider variety of feedbacks. The extension of the project to include more schools would also allow for a broader spread of project related concepts.

d) **Implement a broader range of activities, including interaction between the school deputies who are part of the project and those who are not.** This would ensure a cross fertilization between the

---

\(^5\) See Annex: Graph 3 “What is democracy?”  
\(^6\) See Annex: Graph 7 “How were the school parliamentarians selected?”  
\(^7\) See Annex: Graph 8 “How was the executive team of the parliament chosen?”  
\(^8\) See Annex: Graph 9 “What is your capacity to interact with local authorities after your experience with the school parliament?”
different schools, and exchange of opinions regarding their abilities to interact with the local authorities, deal with identified issues and their understanding of democratic processes. This recommendation is sustained by the above mentioned findings.

*Carry out a key informant questionnaire, as implemented with the Youth Conflict Resolution Centers case study.* This strategy would allow for cross-referencing the data gathered from the survey with the school deputies, as well as to have a confirmation from the schools’ administration regarding their inclination towards any similar future projects.

### 7. CONCLUSIONS

One of the main issues observed throughout the implementation of the project has been student participation to the activities proposed. This can be seen from the answers provided from the deputies to the question regarding the level of participation and engagement of the school parliament deputies. Further analysis shows that the main reasons for this finding are: contrasting schedules, school management or possibly lack of interest of the students themselves. These possibilities are supported by the answers to question 11 concerning the sources of main challenges faced by the deputies during the school parliament project.

From the data given by the project specific topics and issues regarding logistics and project visibility, the deputies showed to have a good experience with SFCG staff and the School parliament project. More specifically, 80% of the students were positively satisfied with the quality of logistics provided by SFCG with only 20% that found it satisfactory. These findings are supported by the answers given to question 19 regarding transportation reimbursements (53% in favor).

Considering the inevitable difficulties and constraints given by the country social and political context, it was possible to gather sufficient data and reliable information to evaluate the effectiveness of the project. That being said, as noticed with the previous phase of the project concerning the Youth Conflict Resolution Centers, it is recommended to provide a more diverse selection of activities with any future project implementation. This is to ensure a more active participation of the students and school deputies.

Furthermore, in view of the opinions provided by the deputies concerning the recommendations for future phases of the project, it is suggested that any similar implementations also contain a more aggressive visibility campaign, in order to maximize the impact and bolster student involvement in the activities, as well as promote the concepts regarding active citizenry and democratic principles.

With regards to the project’s success, an interesting turn of events was observed during the case study. Even though the School Parliament Project is now closed, throughout the final phases of the project, SFCG-Angola has become aware of the possible attrition between the school deputies and government officials that may have risen from sensitive issues of various nature and which have been being discussed and brought to light by the school deputies. Having arrived at the natural termination of the project and abiding to the *do no harm* policy, SFCG brought the project to a close, as the final objective of activating

---

9 See Annex: Graph 6 “Level of participation/engagement from school parliament deputies”

10 See Annex: Graph 5 “Sources of the main challenges faced during the School Parliament”

11 See Annex: Graph 10 “How was the quality of the logistics provided by SFCG” and 19 “Was the transportation stipend you received enough?”
the youth community in their local governance and ultimately interact with their government counterparts was reached. This conclusion is also supported by the data gathered during the survey, and in particular the question regarding the deputies capacity to interact with local authorities. (See Annex: Graph 9)

Lastly, it is important to note that even though the project has come to its natural termination, some of the activities could not be carried out. The reason for this lies in the fact that SFCG partner IASED, was unable to perform as a go-between the school deputies and government officials; this specific task was a crucial requirement for a number of reasons: improving the interaction between the school deputies and government, and subsequently allowing the school deputies to be more effective advocates whilst successfully collaborating with the local authorities in order to find a common ground on the issues identified in their local communities.
8. ANNEX

a. School Parliament Questionnaire

School Parliament Questionnaire

Age:

Gender:  Male  Female

1. What is the School Parliament?
   a) It is a student assembly?
   b) It is a gathering of deputies representing the schools who participate in the project?
   c) It is a student association?
   d) It is a group of students that do politics?

2. What did you benefit from the School Parliament in relation to the context of the country?
   a) A better understanding of the concepts of democracy, transparency and good governance?
   b) A better comprehension of the Republic’s National Assembly’s role and mechanisms?
   c) A better understanding of the role of the youth in the development of adequate laws?
   d) Increased understanding of youth rights and responsibilities?
   e) Better knowledge of the challenges faced by youth?
   f) Increased understanding of advocacy techniques?
   g) Increased understanding of conflict resolution and management?
   h) Others, please specify…

3. In your opinion, what is democracy?
   a) Freedom of speech
   b) Government performance of its duties
   c) Right and responsibilities of citizens
   d) Implementation of social projects by the government

4. In your opinion, what is good governance?
   a) Active population participation to the decision-making process
   b) Implementation of the rule of law
   c) Good governance = Transparency + Government accountability + Active citizen participation to the decision making processes
   d) Civic rights
   e) Good governance and democracy are the same

5. How was the interaction with the SFCG staff?
   a) Excellent
   b) Sufficient
   c) Average
   d) Negative
   e) Very bad

6. Was the SFCG staff on time during the activities?
   a) Yes
7. In your opinion, was the communication with the members of the SFCG staff adequate?
   a) Yes
   b) No

8. Did you receive enough documentation during the course of the project?
   a) Yes
   b) No

9. Did you receive the resolution text on time before the plenary sessions?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   c) Yes, but the time was too short

10. Where you informed on time regarding the School Parliament activities?
    a) Yes, with enough time
    b) Yes, but more time would be better
    c) Never got the information on time

11. What were the main challenges caused by?
    a) The students themselves
    b) The overall implementation of the project
    c) The schools management
    d) SFCG
    e) The lack of schools discussions at the schools
    f) Difficulties to align with the schedule of the activities
    g) I have no interest in the school parliament

12. What was the level of participation/engagement from school parliament deputies?
    a) Very active
    b) Normal
    c) Low

13. How were the schools deputies selected?
    a) I don't have any information
    b) Ad-hoc selection by the students themselves
    c) Nominated by the school director
    d) Elected through a democratic process

14. Did the deputies from your school hold regular exchanges to identify topics relevant to youth?
    a) Yes, regularly and I participated frequently
    b) Yes but I did not participate
    c) Sometimes
    d) Never
    e) They were exchanges but the topics were not relevant

15. Were all the selected topics voted and passed into resolutions?
    a) Yes
    b) No
    c) Some
16. How was the executive team of the parliament chosen?
   a) In a transparent and democratic manner
   b) I have no specific opinion on this
   c) There a law of transparency and the democratic processes were not respected
   d) Negatively because it was an arbitrary process

17. What is your capacity to interact with local authorities after your experience with the school parliament?
   a) Good
   b) Normal
   c) Insufficient
   d) Weak

18. How was the quality of the logistics provided by SFCG?
   a) Excellent
   b) Good
   c) Normal
   d) Bad

19. Was the transportation stipend enough?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   c) Yes, but it could be more substantial

20. How would you evaluate IASED’s participation as a partner in the project?
   a) The students benefited from it
   b) There was no added value
   c) IASED participated was irregular and complicated
   d) It was a total failure

21. What is your expectation for the project's future?
   a) The project must continue but with a fresher orientation
   b) Include new schools of the Luanda province
   c) Do municipal parliaments instead of provincial ones
   d) No need to continue the project because the schools' management are reluctant to it
   e) It's difficult to continue because students change schools often
   f) It's difficult to continue because students are not motivated
   g) It's difficult because SFCG does not show interest in the project
   h) I don’t have any opinion on this matter

22. Did you have the opportunity to participate to the radio programs produced for this project?
   a) Yes, regularly
   b) Irregularly
   c) Sometimes
   d) Never

23. Did you have the opportunity to listen to the radio programs produced for this project?
   a) Yes, every broadcast
   b) No, because I do not have time
   c) No, because the broadcasting schedule does not match my free time
d) No, because the radios broadcasted at the wrong time

e) No, because the radio production were irrelevant to the project

24. **In your opinion, did the project receive enough visibility?**
   a) No visibility at all
   b) Yes, but SFCG could have done more
   c) A bit
   d) Yes

25. **Please, give your recommendations that will be useful for the future of the school parliament**
**Graph 3**

*What is democracy?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freedom of Speech</th>
<th>Government performance of its duties</th>
<th>Rights and obligations of Citizens</th>
<th>Implementation of social projects by the government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Series1</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 4**

*What is Good Governance*

- Good governance and democracy are the same
- Civic rights
- Good governance = Transparency + Govt accountability + active citizen participation to decision-making processes
- Implementation of the rule of law
- Active population participation to decision-making processes
Graph 5

Sources of the main challenges faced during the School Parliament

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The students themselves</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall implementation of the project</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school management</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFCUG</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lack of school discussions at the schools</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties to align with the schedule of the activities</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no interest in the school parliament</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Level of participation/engagement from school parliament deputies**

- Very active: 13%
- Normal: 60%
- Low: 27%

**Graph 7**

**How were the schools parliamentaries selected?**

- Elected through a democratic process: 47%
- Nominated by the school director: 33%
- Ad-hoc selection by the students themselves: 13%
- I don't have any information: 7%

**Graph 8**
Graph 9

What is your capacity to interact with local authorities after your experience with the school parliament?

- Good, 87%
- Normal, 13%
- Weak, 0%
- Insufficient, 0%
24-In your opinion, did the project receive enough visibility?

- Yes
- A bit
- Yes, but SFCG could have done more
- No visibility at all