

REGULATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION IN CITIZEN JOURNALISM

Project: CJ Superheroes Work Package 4 (WP4)

Purpose of the competition: To provide a platform for learners to demonstrate their citizen journalism skills acquired during local trainings, to stimulate project-oriented learning and to give publicity to important societal issues through civic stories.

1. General Terms and Conditions

Total number of participants: 60 - 75 authors (national target: 12 - 15 submissions from each partner country).

Eligible participants: Aimed mainly at the graduates of the local trainings under the project (at least 75% of them must continue to the competition). To ensure inclusion, external persons who have not attended the trainings can also participate in the competition.

Number of winners: A total of 4 winners for each country (a total of 20 for the entire project).

Grand Prix: Participation in the second international training (LTTA2) in Spain, where the winners' materials will be further developed and prepared for publication in real media channels (goal: 75% success rate of publications).

2. Competition categories (groups)

In order to ensure fair competition, the participants compete in two separate groups. From each group at national level, two winners are announced:

Categories

Characteristics	Group 1: Traditional journalism	Group 2: AI-assisted journalism
Basic requirement	The author develops the material entirely independently, without the use of AI tools.	The author uses AI tools in the process of creating the material.
Allowed Tools	Word processors, standard spell checker (Word, Grammarly), standard photo/video editor.	ChatGPT, Claude, Midjourney, Canva AI, digital avatars, AI voice generators, and more.
Prerequisite	Declaration of authorship and authenticity of the collected information.	Prompt Log: A mandatory application describing which AI tools were used for what and with what prompts.
Quota for winners	2 winners for each country.	2 winners for each country.

3. Format and material requirements

All application materials are submitted in the **Media category**. Participants have complete freedom to choose the format they want for their story:

Text format: An article, report, interview or essay (preferably between 500 and 1500 words), accompanied by at least one author's or licensed photo/graphics.

Video format: Video reportage, documentary short video or mobile journalism (content created via mobile phone for social media distribution) of up to 5 minutes in length.

Audio format: A podcast episode or audio report with a duration of up to 10 minutes.

Language of materials: All materials are developed and submitted in **the national language** of the country concerned.

Note: The four selected winners will have to prepare a summary or translation of their materials into English for the needs of studying in Spain (LTTA2).

4. Evaluation procedure and panel of judges

Structure of the jury

The national jury for each country consists of 2 independent judges, coordinated by the partner organization:

Judge 1: A member of the team of the partner involved in the development of the modules (WP2) or a trainer.

Judge 2: External expert from the associated partners (professional journalist, media expert or public figure).

Evaluation mechanism

The assessment is carried out according to a single 100-point rubric developed by the lead partner FECE.

Step 1.

The two judges evaluate each material independently of each other, filling in the official scorecard with comments to each criterion.

Step 2.

The partner organization collects the cards and calculates the final score as an arithmetic average of the points of the two judges.

Stage 3 (arbitration if necessary):

If the difference between the scores of the two judges is greater than 20 points, the partner organization appoints a third judge who makes an independent reassessment of the material. The final score is the number of points of the first or second judge, which are closer to the number of points given by the arbitrator.

Step 4.

The first two materials are ranked (one pair from Group 1 and one pair from Group 2). The authors of the four materials, two from each group, are officially declared winners.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Common criteria for both categories (60 points)

The common criteria assess the journalistic value of the media material and apply equally to both groups of participants.

1. Public importance and choice of topic (20 points)

Description of the criterion: To what extent does the story address a real, significant social problem in the local community? Does it have a clear focus and an original point of view?

2. Journalistic ethics and objectivity (20 points)

Description of the criterion: Have the principles of impartiality, respect for human dignity and the presentation of different points of view been respected? Is there a clear distinction between facts and personal opinions?

3. Story structure and impact (20 points)

Description of the criterion: Does the material have a logical structure (title, introduction, presentation, conclusion)? Does it grab the audience's attention and is the language clear (no matter if it is text, audio or video)?

Specific criteria (40 points)

Here, the scorecard includes ONLY one of the two groups of criteria, depending on the group in which the participant competes.

Group 1 Criteria Traditional Journalism

The focus is on the author's personal skills for fieldwork and independent creativity.

1. Field work and sources (20 points)

Use of primary sources (interviews with citizens, experts, institutions).

On-site documentation (personal photos, audio, video)

2. Creative performance and author's handwriting (20 points)

Writing/storytelling style, authenticity and creativity in design or shooting, achieved entirely through in-house efforts.

Group 2 criteria for AI-assisted journalism

The focus is on digital literacy, the effective use of AI tools, and quality control of generated content.

1. Transparency and Prompt Engineering (20 points)

The Prompt Log provided is appreciated. Are prompts complex and precisely defined or are they basic one-line commands?

Are the AI tools optimally selected for the specific task?

2. Fact-checking and control over the generated result (20 points)

Are there any traces of "AI hallucinations" (fictitious facts, non-existent data)?

Has the author proven that they have verified and corrected the AI-generated content through independent sources?

PROMPT LOG

Mandatory for participants in Group 2 AI-assisted journalism

Participant name:

Title of the media material:

Country:

1. AI tools used

Please mark with an "X" what exactly you used the tools for (you can select more than one option) and indicate the specific name of the tool (e.g. ChatGPT, Claude, Midjourney, Canva AI, ElevenLabs, etc.):

☐ **For Word Processing / Research:**

☐ **For Image / Graphics Generation:**

☐ **For Audio/Video/Subtitles:**

☐ **Others:**

2. Work process and key prompts

Briefly describe how and what you used AI tools for. Copy 2 or 3 of the most important prompts (commands) that gave the best result for your project.

Step 1: Research / Structure the idea

Sample prompt I used: "... [Copy the text of the command here]..."

Step 2: Create the content (Text, image or video)

Sample prompt I used: "... [Copy the text of the command here]..."

Step 3: Edit

Sample prompt I used: "... [Copy the text of the command here]..."

3. Fact-Checking and Human Intervention

Important: Artificial intelligence often "hallucinates" (makes up facts, dates, or statistics). Describe how you checked the information.

Which AI-generated facts or content have you questioned?

Answer:

How did you check the information and which official sources did you use for correction?

Answer:

How much of the final material was written (changed) entirely by you?

Answer:

Statement on the ethical use of AI

By sending this diary, I declare that I have used artificial intelligence tools as an assistant, but the ultimate responsibility, fact-checking and ethical position behind the story are entirely mine.

Signature: